arXiv:1611.04171v1 [math.NA] 13 Nov 2016

Convergence and error estimates for the Lagrangian based Conservative Spectral method for Boltzmann Equations

Ricardo J. Alonso, Irene M. Gamba, Sri Harsha Tharkabhushanam

November 15, 2016

Abstract

In this paper we study the approximation properties of the spectral conservative method for the elastic and inelastic Boltzmann problem introduced by the authors in [48]. The method is based on the Fourier transform of the collisional operator and a Lagrangian optimization correction used for conservation of mass, momentum and energy. We present an analysis on the accuracy and consistency of the method, for both elastic and inelastic collisions, and a discussion of the $L^{1,2}$ theory for the scheme in the elastic case which includes the estimation of the negative mass generated by the scheme. This analysis allows us to present Sobolev convergence and error estimates for the numerical approximation. The estimates are based on recent progress of convolution and gain of integrability estimates by some of the authors and a corresponding moment inequality for the discretized collision operator. The Lagrangian optimization correction algorithm is not only crucial for the error estimates and the convergence to the equilibrium Maxwellian, but also it is absolutely necessary for the moments conservation for systems of kinetic equations in mixtures and chemical reactions. The results of this work answer a long standing open problem posed by Cercignani et al. in [31, Chapter 12] about finding error estimates for a Boltzmann scheme.

Key words. Nonlinear integral equations, Rarefied gas flows, Boltzmann equations, conservative spectral methods.

AMS subject classifications. 45E99, 35A22, 35Q20, 65C20,65C30, 65M70, 76X05, 76P05, 82C05

1 Introduction

The Boltzmann Transport Equation is an integro-differential transport equation that describes the evolution of a single point probability density function $f(x, v, t)$ defined as the probability of finding a particle at

position x with kinetic velocity v at time t. The mathematical and computational difficulties associated to the Boltzmann equation are due to the non local and non linear nature of the binary collision operator, which is usually modeled as a bilinear integral form in 3-dimensional velocity space and unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$. Our work extends to higher dimensions $d \geq 3$.

The focus of this manuscript is to provide a complete consistency and error analysis and long time convergence to statistical equilibrium states for the Lagrangian minimization Spectral conservative scheme proposed in [48] to solve the dynamics of elastic binary collisions and more. In particular, the results of this work answer a long standing open problem posed by Cercignani, Illner and Pulvirenti in [31, Chapter 12] about finding error estimates for a consistent non linear Boltzmann deterministic scheme for elastic binary interactions in the case of hard potentials

In a microscopic description of a rarefied gas without external forces, all particles are traveling in straight line with constant speed until they collide. In such dilute flows, binary collisions are often assumed to be the main mechanism of particle interactions. The statistical effect of such collisions can be modeled using a Boltzmann or Enskog transport equation type, where the kinetic dynamics of the gas are subject to the molecular chaos assumption. The nature of these interactions could be elastic, inelastic or coalescing. They could either be isotropic or anisotropic, depending on their collision rates as a function of the scattering angle. In addition, collisions are described in terms of inter-particle potentials and the rate of collisions is usually modeled as product of power laws for the relative speed and the differential cross section, at the time of the interaction. When the rate of collisions is independent of the relative speed, the interaction is referred to as of Maxwell type. When it corresponds to relative speed to a positive power less than unity, they are referred to as Variable Hard Potentials (VHP) and when the rate of collisions is proportional to the relative speed, it is referred to as hard spheres.

The problem of computing efficiently the Boltzmann Transport Equation has interested many authors that have introduced different approaches. These approaches can be classified as stochastic methods known as Direct Simulation Montecarlo Methods (DSMC [8; 68; 71; 72; 76; 47]) and deterministic methods (Discrete Velocity Models [53; 54; 26; 25; 12; 30; 59; 79; 51], Boltzmann approximations - Lattice Boltzmann, BGK and Spectral methods [43; 20; 70; 9; 11; 21; 22; 69; 52; 38; 39; 65]). Spectral based methods, our choice for this work, have been developed by I.M. Gamba and H.S Tharkabhushanam [48] inpired in the work develoed a decade earlier by Pareschi, Gabetta and Toscani [43] and later by Bobylev and Rjasanow [20] and Pareschi and Russo [70]. The practical implementation of these methods are supported by the ground breaking work of Bobylev [9] using the Fourier Transformed Boltzmann Equation to analyze its solutions in the case of Maxwell type of interactions. After the introduction of the inelastic Boltzmann equation for Maxwell type interactions and the use of the Fourier transform for its analysis in Bobylev, Carrillo and Gamba [11], the spectral based approach is becoming the most suitable tool to deal with deterministic computations of kinetic models associated with the full Boltzmann collisional integral, both for elastic or inelastic interactions. Re-

cent implementations of spectral methods for the non-linear Boltzmann are due to Bobylev and Rjasanow [20] who developed a method using the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) for Maxwell type of interactions and then for Hard-Sphere interactions [21] using generalized Radon and X-ray transforms via FFT. Simultaneously, L. Pareschi and B. Perthame [69] developed similar scheme using FFT for Maxwell type of interactions. Using [70; 69] Filbet and Russo in [38] and [39] have implemented an scheme to solve the space inhomogeneous Boltzmann equation. Finally, we mention the work of I. Ibragimov and S. Rjasanow [52] who developed a numerical method to solve the space homogeneous Boltzmann Equation on an uniform grid for a Variable Hard Potential interactions with elastic collisions. This particular work has been a great inspiration for the current paper and was one of the first steps in the direction of a new numerical method.

The aforementioned works on deterministic solvers for non-linear BTE have been restricted to elastic, conservative interactions. Mouhot and Pareschi [65] have studied some approximation properties of the schemes. Part of the difficulties in their strategy arises from the constraint that the numerical solution has to satisfy conservation of the initial mass. To this end, the authors propose the use of a periodic representation of the distribution function to avoid aliasing. Closely related to this problem is the fact that spectral methods do not guarantee the positivity of the solution due to the combined effects of the truncation in velocity domain (of the equation) and the application of the Fourier transform (computed for the truncated problem). In addition to this, there is no *a priori* conservation of mass, momentum and energy in [39], [38] and [65]. In fact, the authors in [37] presented a stability and convergence analysis of the spectral method for the homogeneous Boltzmann equation for binary elastic collisions using the periodization approach proposed in those previous references. In their results, the spectral scheme enforced mass conservation only that, as a consequence, produced numerical solutions converging to the constant state for such initial mass, violating the conservation of initial energy, exhibiting that the time asymptotic behavior is destroyed and the method does not yield the equilibrium Maxwellian corresponding to the Boltzmann space homogeneous flow as predicted by the Boltzmann and H -Theorems.

The proposed conservative approach in [48] is shown in this manuscript to handle conservation problem in a natural way by means of Lagrange multipliers, and show consistency, error estimates and long time convergence to the equilibrium Maxwellian without enforcing positivity.

Our approximation by conservative spectral Lagrangian schemes and corresponding computational method, is based on a modified version of the work in [20] and [52]. This spectral approach combined with a constrain minimization problem works for elastic or inelastic collisions and energy dissipative non-linear Boltzmann type models for variable hard potentials. We do not use periodic representations for the distribution function and the only restriction of the current method is that it requires that the distribution function to be Fourier transformable at any time step. This is met by imposing L^2-integrability to the initial datum. The required conservation properties of the distribution function are enforced through an optimization problem with the

desired conservation quantities set as the constraints. The correction to the distribution function that makes the approximation conservative is very small but crucial for the evolution of the probability distribution function according to the Boltzmann equation.

More recently, this conservative spectral Lagrangian method for the Boltzmann equation was applied to the calculation of the Boltzmann flow for anisotropic collisions, even in the Coulomb interaction regime [44], where the solution of the Boltzmann equation approximates solution for Landau equation [58; 57].

It has also been extended to systems of elastic and inelastic hard potential problems modeling of a multi-energy level gas [67]. In this case, the formulation of the numerical method accounts for both elastic and inelastic collisions. It was also be used for the particular case of a chemical mixture of monatomic gases without internal energy. The conservation of mass, momentum and energy during collisions is enforced through the solution of constrained optimization problem to keep the collision invariances associated to the mixtures. The implementation was done in the space in-homogeneous setting (see [67], section 4.3), where the advection along the free Hamiltonian dynamics is modeled by time splitting methods following the initial approach in [49]. The effectiveness of the scheme applied to these mixtures has been compared with the results obtained by means of the DSMC method and excellent agreement has been observed.

In addition, this conservative spectral Lagrangian method has been implemented in a system of electron-ion in plasma modeled by a $2X2$ system of Poisson-Vlasov-Landau equations [81] using time splitting methods, that is, staggering the time steps for advection of the Vlasov-Poisson system and the collisional system including recombinations. The constrained optimization problem is applied to the collisional step in a revised version from [48] where such minimization problem was posed and solved in Fourier space, using the exact formulas for the Fourier Transform of the collision invariant polynomials. The benchmarking for the constrained optimization implementation for the mixing problem was done for an example of a space homogeneous system where the explicit decay difference for electron and ion temperatures is known [81], section 7.1.2. Yet, the used scheme captures the total conserved temperature being a convex sum of the ions and electron temperatures respectively.

This manuscript focus on analysis of errors and convergence to the equilibrium Maxwellian solution that solely depends on the initial state associated to the Cauchy problem for the scalar space homogeneous non-linear Boltzmann for elastic binary interactions.

The main results on convergence, error estimates and asymptotic behavior are stated in the the following theorem, whose rigorous proof is developed in the rest of the manuscript.

Theorem 1.1 (**Error estimates and convergence to the equilibrium Maxwellian**). *Fix an initial nonnegative initial data* $f_0 \in \big(L^1_2 \cap L^2\big)(\mathbb{R}^d)$. *Then, for any time* $T > 0$ *there exist a lateral size* $L := L(T, f_0)$ *and a number of modes* $N_0 := N(T, L, f_0)$ *such that*

1. **Semi-discrete existence and uniqueness:** *The semi-discrete problem* (3.1) *has a unique solution* $g \in \mathcal{C}\big(0, T; L^2(\Omega_L)\big)$ *for any* $N \geq N_0$.

2. L^2_k**-error estimates:** *If* $f_0 \in \big(L^1 \cap L^2\big)_{k'+k+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *for some* k', $k \geq 0$, *then*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq CL^{-\lambda k'} e^{cT}\,, \quad \textit{for any } N \geq N_0\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $N_0 := N(T, L, f_0, k)$, $C := C(k, f_0)$, $c := c(k, f_0)$ *and* f *is the solution of the Boltzmann equation* (2.1) *to* (2.5).

3. H^α**-error estimates:** *For the smooth case* $f_0 \in \big(L^1_2 \cap H^{\alpha_0}_q\big)(\mathbb{R}^d)$, *with* $\alpha_0 > 0$ *and* $q = \max\{k'+k, 1+\frac{d}{2\lambda}\}$, *with* $k' \geq 2$, *it follows for any* $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f-g\|_{H^\alpha_k(\Omega_L)} \leq C_{k'} e^{c_k T}\left(O\left(\frac{L^{\lambda k+|\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0|-|\alpha|}}\right) + O\big(L^{-\lambda k'}\big)\right), \quad \textit{for any } N \geq N_0, \tag{1.2}$$

where $N_0 := N(T, L, f_0, k, \alpha)$. *In addition, taking the Sobolev extension* Eg *of approximate solution* g *to all* $\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f-g\|_{H^\alpha_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_{k'} e^{c_k T}\left(O\left(\frac{L^{\lambda k+|\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0|-|\alpha|}}\right) + O\big(L^{-\lambda k'}\big)\right) + \mu, \quad \textit{for any } N \geq N_0, \tag{1.3}$$

with μ *a constant to be chosen as small as desired, depending only on the mass* ρ_0 *and temperature* T_0 *of the initial state* f_0. *The* μ *parameter determines the minimal length* L_* *of a cut-off domain* Ω_L *for the numerical error being measured globally in* R^d *(see section 2.2)*

4. **Convergence to the equilibrium Maxwellian:** *For every* $\delta > 0$ *there exist a simulation time* $T := T(\delta) > 0$, *corresponding lateral size* $L := L(T, f_0)$ *and baseline number of modes* $N_0 := N_0(T, L, f_0, \alpha)$ *such that for any* $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$

$$\sup_{t\in[\frac{T}{2},T]} \|\mathcal{M}_0 - g\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)} \leq \delta\,, \quad N \geq N_0\,, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_0$ *is the equilibrium Maxwellian* (2.10) *having the same mass, momentum and kinetic energy of the initial configuration* $f_0(v)$.

The proof of this Theorem relies on the control problem that enforces conservation at the numerical level. This is a key idea that shows that the conservative Spectral Lagrangian scheme converges to the Gaussian distribution in v-space, referred as the equilibrium Maxwellian (2.10) as stated in item 4. of Theorem 1.1 above.

Remark 1.2. One should note that the conservation sub-scheme enforces the collision invariants, which is sufficient to show the convergence result to the Maxwellian equilibrium (1.4) in the case of an scalar space homogeneous Boltzmann equation for binary elastic interactions. This is exactly how the Boltzmann and H- Theorems [31] work: the equilibrium Maxwellian (2.10) is proven to be the stationary state due to the conservation properties combined with the elastic collision law.

For the case of inelastic collisions (when the collision invariants are just $d+2$ polynomials) or for space inhomogeneous multi-component Boltzmann systems flow models, it is not correct to assume that the

stationary state of a Maxwellian (i.e. a Gaussian in v-space), and so schemes that enforce local or global Maxwellian behavior will generate errors.

In fact, in the case of the scalar homogeneous Boltzmann for binary inelastic collisions of Maxwell type, our scheme is able to accurately compute the evolution to self similar states with power tails, by exhibiting the predicted corresponding moment growth as performed in [48]. In the case of mixtures in chemical reacting gases, [67] and [81], recombination terms are not elastic interactions, even if the particle-particle is interaction is elastic. While each component of the gas mixture does not conserve energy, the total system does. Our conservation scheme then enforces the proper collision invariants for the total system by enforcing a convex combination of the thermodynamic macroscopic quantities, but not for the collision invariants of individual components.

The enforcing of the system conserved total quantities by the suitable constrain minimization problem associated to initial data for the mixture will selects the correct equilibrium states associated to each system component. A proof of this statement would require to adjust the *Conservation Correction Estimate* of Lemma 3.3 now extended to the adequate convex combination of collision invariants corresponding to the initial data of the system, as it was computed in [67] for a 2×2 Neon Argon gas mixture or a 5×5 multi-energy level gas mixture using the classical hard sphere model, as well as in [81] for an electron ion plasma mixture using the Landau equation for Coulomb potentials.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, the preliminaries and description of the spectral method for space homogenous Boltzmann equation are presented. In section 3, we introduce the optimization problem proving the basic estimates including spectral accuracy and consistency results in both elastic and inelastic collisions in Theorem 3.3. In Sections 4 and 5 we develop the existence, convergence and error estimates for the scheme. The methodology we follow is summarized in the following steps

1. In Section 4 we start proving in Proposition 4.1 a local in time existence of the scheme, its convergence and local estimation of the negative mass production. This result hold for any initial configuration in L^2 regardless of its sign.

2. We introduce an small negative mass assumption (4.10) and prove uniform in time propagation of moments in Lemma 4.3 and L^2-norm in Lemma 4.5 under this assumption.

3. The details of Theorem 1.1 are given in Section 5. Here we remove assumption (4.10), using the local result given in Lemma 4.1 and the uniform estimates previously found, by invoking a simple induction argument and give a global in time existence, convergence, and estimation of the negative mass generated by the scheme. This is presented in Theorem 5.1.

4. We use such theorem to give quantitative uniform in time L^2-error estimates in Theorem 5.2. The uniform propagation and error estimates in Sobolev norms are also presented in Lemma 4.6 and Theorem 5.3 assuming regularity on the initial configuration. Finally, these results are used to prove convergence of the scheme to correct Maxwellian steady state in Theorem 5.5.

Finally, some conclusion are drawn in Section 6 and a complete toolbox is given in the Appendix–Section 8.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The Boltzmann equation and its Fourier representation

The initial value problem associated to the space homogeneous Boltzmann Transport Equation modeling the statistical evolution of a single point probability distribution function $f(v,t)$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(v,t) = Q(f,f)(v,t) \text{ in } (0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{2.1}$$

with initial condition $f(v,0)=f_0$. The weak form of the collision integral is given by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(f,f)(v)\,\phi(v)\,\mathrm{d}v = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(v,t)f(w,t)[\phi(v')-\phi(v)]\,B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\,\mathrm{d}\sigma\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}v\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where the corresponding velocity interaction law exchanging velocity pairs $\{v,w\}$ into post-collisional pairs $\{v',w'\}$ is given by the law

$$v' = v+\frac{\beta}{2}(|u|\sigma-u) \;\text{ and }\; w' = w-\frac{\beta}{2}(|u|\sigma-u), \tag{2.3}$$

where $\beta\in(1/2,1]$ is the energy dissipation parameter, $u=v-w$ is the relative velocity and $\sigma\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is the unit direction of the post collisional relative velocity $u'=v'-w'$.

The collision kernel, quantifying the rate of collisions during interactions, carries important properties that are of fundamental importance for the regularity therory of the Boltzmann collisional integral. It is assumed to be

$$B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma) = |u|^{\lambda}\,b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\,,\quad\text{with}\;\; 0\le\lambda\le 1\,. \tag{2.4}$$

The scattering angle θ is defined by $\cos\theta = |u|^{-1}u\cdot\sigma$. Further, we assume that the differential cross section kernel $b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)$ is integrable in $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, referred as the *Grad cut-off assumption* [50], and it is renormalized in the sense that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\,\mathrm{d}\sigma = \left|\mathbb{S}^{d-2}\right|\int_0^{\pi} b(\cos\theta)\sin^{d-2}\theta\,\mathrm{d}\theta = \left|\mathbb{S}^{d-2}\right|\int_{-1}^{1} b(s)(1-s^2)^{(d-3)/2}\mathrm{d}s\;=1\,, \tag{2.5}$$

where the constant $\left|\mathbb{S}^{d-2}\right|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of $\mathbb{S}^{d-2}$. The parameter λ in (2.4) regulates the collision frequency and accounts for inter particle potentials occurring in the gas. These interactions are referred to as Variable Hard Potentials (VHP) whenever $0<\lambda<1$, Maxwell Molecules type interactions (MM) for $\lambda=0$ and Hard Spheres (HS) for $\lambda=1$. In addition, if kernel b is independent of the scattering angle we call the interactions isotropic, otherwise, we refer to them as anisotropic Variable Hard Potential interactions.

It is worth to mention that the weak form of the collisional form (2.2) also takes the following weighted double mixing convolutional form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(f,f)(v)\,\phi(v)\,\mathrm{d}v = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(v,t)f(v-u,t)\,\mathcal{G}(v,u)\mathrm{d}u\mathrm{d}v\,. \tag{2.6}$$

The weight function defined by

$$\mathcal{G}(v,u)=\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}[\phi(v')-\phi(v)]\,B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\,\mathrm{d}\sigma \tag{2.7}$$

depends on the test function $\phi(v)$, the collisional kernel $B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)$ from (2.4) and the exchange of collisions law (2.3).

This is actually a generic form of a Kac master equation formulation for a binary multiplicatively interactive stochastic Chapman-Kolmogorov birth-death rate processes, were the weight function $\mathcal{G}(v,u)$ encodes the detailed balance properties, collision invariants as well as existence, regularity and decay rate dynamics to equilibrium.

We also denote by $'v$ and $'w$ the pre-collision velocities corresponding to v and w. In the case of elastic collisions (i.e. $\beta=1$) the pairs $\{'v,'w\}$ and $\{v',w'\}$ agree, otherwise, extra caution has to be made in the handling of the collision operator.

Collision invariants and conservation properties. The collision law (2.3) is equivalent to the following relation between the interacting velocity pairs

$$v+w=v'+w' \quad \text{and} \quad |v|^2+|w|^2=|v'|^2+|w'|^2-\beta(1-\beta)B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma).$$

The parameter $\beta\in[\frac{1}{2},1]$ is related to the degree of inelasticity of the interactions, with $\beta=1$ being elastic and $\beta<1$ inelastic interactions. In particular, when testing with the polynomials $\varphi(v)=1,\ v_j,\ |v|^2$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, yields the following conservation relations

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\begin{pmatrix}1\\ v_j\\ |v|^2\end{pmatrix}\mathrm{d}v=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(v_*)f(v)\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}\begin{pmatrix}0\\ 0\\ -\beta(1-\beta)\end{pmatrix}B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\mathrm{d}\sigma\mathrm{d}v_*\mathrm{d}v\,. \tag{2.8}$$

The polynomials that make the collisional integral vanish are called collision invariants. Clearly, the elastic case when $\beta=1$, the homogeneous Boltzmann equation has $d+2$ collision invariants and corresponding conservation laws, namely mass, momentum and kinetic energy. For the inelastic case of $\beta<1$, the number of invariants and conserved quantities is $d+1$.

Finally, when testing with $\varphi(v)=\log f(v)$ yields the inequality ($\mathcal{H}$-Theorem holding for the elastic case)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\log f\mathrm{d}v&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(f)\log f\mathrm{d}v\\ &=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(w)f(v)\left(\log\left(\frac{f(w')f(v')}{f(w)f(v)}\right)+\frac{f(w')f(v')}{f(w)f(v)}-1\right)B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\mathrm{d}\sigma\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}v\\ &\qquad+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(w)f(v)\left(\frac{1}{(2\beta-1)J_\beta}-1\right)B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\mathrm{d}\sigma\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}v\\ &\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}\times\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(w)f(v)\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}}\left(\frac{1}{(2\beta-1)J_\beta}-1\right)B(|u|,\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\mathrm{d}\sigma\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{d}v=0\ \text{ iff }\ \beta=1\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Recall the following fundamental result in elastic particle theory.

The Boltzmann Theorem (for $\beta = 1$): $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(f) \log f = 0 \iff \log f(v) = a + \mathbf{b} \cdot v - c|v|^2$, where $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $c > 0$, where the parameters a, $\mathbf{b}$ and c are determined by the initial state moments given by the $d+2$ collision invariants.

That means, given an initial state $f_0(v) \geq 0$ for a.e. $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_0(v)(1+|v|^2)\, dv < \infty$. In the limit as $t \to +\infty$, we expect that $f(v,t)$ converges to the *equilibrium Maxwellian* distribution, i.e.

$$f(t,v) \to M[m_0, u_0, T_0](v) := m_0 (2\pi T_0)^{-d/2} \exp\left(-\frac{|v-u_0|^2}{2T_0}\right), \tag{2.10}$$

where, if $m_0 > 0$ is the density mass, and the *moments or observables* are defined by

$$m_0 := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_0(v)\, dv\,, \quad u_0 := \frac{1}{m_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_0(v)\, dv\,, \quad T_0 := (dm_0)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v-u_0|^2 f_0(v)\, dv$$

while $f(v,t) = 0$ for a.e. $(v,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+$ if $m_0 = 0$. The quantities m_0, u_0 and T_0 are the density mass, mean and variance, respectively, associated to probability density $f(v,t)$.

The Fourier formulation of the collisional form. One of the pivotal points in the derivation of the spectral numerical method for the computation of the non-linear Boltzmann equation lies in the representation of the collision integral in Fourier space by means of its weak form. Indeed taking the Fourier multiplier as the test function, i.e.

$$\psi(v) = \frac{e^{-i\zeta\cdot v}}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d}$$

in the weak formulation (2.2), where ζ is the Fourier variable, one obtains the Fourier transform of the collision integral

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{Q(f,f)}(\zeta) &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(f,f) e^{-i\zeta\cdot v} \mathrm{d}v \\
&= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} f(v) f(w) B(|u|, \hat{u}\cdot\sigma) \left(e^{-i\zeta\cdot v'} - e^{-i\zeta\cdot v}\right) \mathrm{d}\sigma \mathrm{d}w \mathrm{d}v\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (2.4,2.6,2.7) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{Q(f,f)}(\zeta) &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f(v) f(w) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u|^\lambda b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma) e^{-i\zeta\cdot v} \left(e^{-i\frac{\beta}{2}\zeta\cdot(|u|\sigma - u))} - 1\right) \mathrm{d}\sigma \mathrm{d}w \mathrm{d}v \\
&= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(v) f(v-u) e^{-i\zeta\cdot v} \mathrm{d}v \right) G_{\lambda,\beta}(u,\zeta) \mathrm{d}u \\
&= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{f\, \tau_{-u} f}(\zeta)\, G_{\lambda,\beta}(u,\zeta)\, \mathrm{d}u\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

where the weight function $G_{\lambda,\beta}(u,\zeta)$ is defined by the spherical integration

$$G_{\lambda,\beta}(u,\zeta) := |u|^\lambda \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma) \left(e^{-i\frac{\beta}{2}\zeta\cdot(|u|\sigma - u))} - 1\right) \mathrm{d}\sigma\,. \tag{2.12}$$

Note that (2.12) is valid for both isotropic and anisotropic interactions. In addition, the function $G_{\lambda,\beta}(u,\zeta)$ is oscillatory and trivially bounded by $|u|^\lambda$ due to the integrability of $b(\cdot)$ from the Grad's cut-off assumption. Further simplification ensues for the three dimensional isotropic case where a simple computation gives

$$G^{\mathrm{iso}}(u,\zeta) = |u|^\lambda \left(e^{i\frac{\beta}{2}\zeta\cdot u}\, \mathrm{sinc}\left(\frac{\beta|u||\zeta|}{2}\right) - 1 \right). \tag{2.13}$$

In addition, recalling elementary properties of the Fourier transform yields

$$\widehat{f\,\tau_{-u}f}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d}\,\hat{f} * \widehat{\tau_{-u}f}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\hat{f}(\zeta-\xi)\widehat{\tau_{-u}f}(\xi)\mathrm{d}\xi$$
$$= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\hat{f}(\zeta-\xi)\hat{f}(\xi)e^{-i\xi\cdot u}\mathrm{d}\xi\,.$$

Hence, using this last identity into (2.11), we finally obtain the following structure in Fourier space

$$\widehat{Q(f,f)}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\hat{f}(\zeta-\xi)\hat{f}(\xi)\widehat{G_{\lambda,\beta}}(\xi,\zeta)\mathrm{d}\xi\,, \tag{2.14}$$

where

$$\widehat{G_{\lambda,\beta}}(\xi,\zeta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G_{\lambda,\beta}(u,\zeta)e^{-i\xi\cdot u}\mathrm{d}u\,. \tag{2.15}$$

That is, the Fourier transform of the collision operator $\widehat{Q(f,f)}(\zeta)$ is a weighted convolution of the inputs in Fourier space with weight $\widehat{G_{\lambda,\beta}}(\xi,\zeta)$.

As an example, we compute the weight for the isotropic case in three dimensions. Assume that f has support in the ball or radius $\sqrt{3}L$, hence, the domain of integration for the relative velocity is the ball of radius $2\sqrt{3}L$. Using polar coordinates $u = r\omega$,

$$\widehat{G^{\mathrm{iso}}}(\xi,\zeta) = \int_0^\infty\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} r^2 G^{\mathrm{iso}}(r\omega,\zeta)e^{-ir\xi\cdot\omega}\mathrm{d}\omega\mathrm{d}r$$
$$= 4\int_0^{2\sqrt{3}L} r^{\lambda+2}\left(\mathrm{sinc}\left(\frac{r\beta|\zeta|}{2}\right)\mathrm{sinc}\left(r|\frac{\beta}{2}\zeta-\xi|\right) - \mathrm{sinc}\left(r|\xi|\right)\right)\mathrm{d}r. \tag{2.16}$$

A point worth noting here is that the numerical calculation of expression (2.14) results in $O(N^{2d})$ number of operations, where N is the number of discretization in each velocity component (i.e. N counts the total number of Fourier modes for each d-dimensional velocity) space. However it may be possible to reduce the number of operations to $O(N^{2d-1}\log N)$ for any anisotropic kernel and any initial state. Due to the oscillatory nature of the weight function (2.16) even in the simple case of 3 dimensions for the hard sphere case, when $b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma) = 4\pi$, such calculation can not be accomplished by $N\log N$ if the initial state is far from a Maxwellian state or has an initial discontinuity, as claimed in [38].

Before continue with the discussion we recall the definition of the Lebesgue's spaces $L^p_k(\Omega)$ and the Hilbert spaces $H^\alpha_k(\Omega)$. These spaces will be used along the manuscript. The set Ω could be any measurable set in the case of the L^p_k spaces or any open set in the case of the H^α_k spaces, however, for our present purpose Ω is either $(-L,L)^d$ or $\mathbb{R}^d$ most of the time.

$$L^p_k(\Omega) := \left\{f\ :\ \|f\|_{L^p_k(\Omega)} := \Big(\int_\Omega \big|f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\big|^p\mathrm{d}v\Big)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty\right\},\quad \text{with } p\in[1,\infty),\ k\in\mathbb{R},$$
$$H^\alpha_k(\Omega) := \left\{f\ :\ \|f\|_{H^\alpha_k(\Omega)} := \Big(\sum_{\beta\le\alpha}\|D^\beta f\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty\right\},\quad \text{with } \alpha\in\mathbb{N}^d,\ k\in\mathbb{R},$$

where $\langle v\rangle := \sqrt{1+|v|^2}$. The standard definition is used for the case $p=\infty$,

$$L^\infty_k(\Omega) := \Big\{ f \,:\, \|f\|_{L^\infty_k(\Omega)} := \operatorname{esssup} \big| f(v)\langle v\rangle^k \big| < \infty \Big\}, \quad \text{with } \; k \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

It will be commonly used the following shorthand to ease notation when the domain Ω is clear from the context

$$\|\cdot\|_{L^p_k(\Omega)} = \|\cdot\|_{L^p_k} = \|\cdot\|_{p,k}\,,$$

and the subindex k will be omitted in the norms for the classical spaces L^p and H^α.

2.2 Choosing a computational cut-off domain

Because the computation of the Boltzmann equation entices to numerically solve the evolution of a probability distribution function defined in the whole $\mathbb{R}^d$-space, it is relevant to carefully discuss the choice of a computational cut-off domain in such a way that the numerical error for the flow evolution is negligible regarding this choice of computational window.

We recall recent analytical results that will secure that such choice is not only possible but also crucial for the development of error estimates. The discussion of this section is independent of the choice computational scheme and applies to new approaches such as the recently developed in [80] for a Galerkin approach to the computation of the Boltzmann equation.

Let $f(v,t)$ be a solution of the elastic homogeneous Boltzmann equation lying in $\mathcal{C}\big(0,T;H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)\big)$ for a given initial state $f(v,0)=f_0(v)\in H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$, see [66; 5] for a mathematical discussion. A natural question to ask is: can one secure the propagation of regularity and tail decay for the solution of the Botlzmann problem, uniformly in time? What are good functional spaces for probability distribution functions that are solutions of the Boltzmann flow problem? These questions were addressed by several people, including Carleman [27], Arkeryd [7], Desvilletes [32], Wennberg [77], Bobylev [10], Bobylev, Gamba and Panferov [18]), Gamba, Panferov and Villani [46], Alonso and Gamba [4] and more recently Alonso, Cañizo, Gamba and Mohout [1]. These last few works answer these two posed questions in a form that is suitable for any computational approach of the space homogeneous elastic Boltzmann equation.

For the discussion, we introduce the following notation for exponentially weighted integrable functions. Define

$$L^1_{(r,s)}(\mathbb{R}^d) \;:=\; \Big\{ g \;:\; \|g\|_{L^1_{(r,s)}} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|g(y)\big|\, e^{r|y|^s}\mathrm{d}y \;<\infty \Big\}, \qquad \text{with } r>0,\; s\in(0,2]\,, \tag{2.17}$$

and the analogous definition for the spaces $L^p_{(r,s)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p\in(1,\infty]$. When $s=2$, nonnegative elements in $L^1_{(r,s)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are Gaussian (or Maxwellian) weighted regular probability densities, meaning that the probability density g not only has all its moments bounded but also grow as the moments of a Gaussian distribution. That also means the density $g(y)$ decays like $e^{-r|y|^2}$ with rate r for large $|y|$ in the sense of L^1. In particular, one may view r^{-1} as the corresponding Gaussian or Maxwellian *tail temperature* of the density.

When $0 < s < 2$ the density g is a *super-Gaussian* distribution with moments comparable to those of $e^{-r|v|^s}$. These probability states are stationary solutions associated to the dynamics of the dissipative homogeneous Boltzmann equation with randomly heated sources or shear forces or homogeneous cooling states calculated by self similar renormalization, as in the case of granular gases.

In the case the elastic homogenous Boltzmann equation flow, it was shown in [46] and more recently in [1] (using methods developed in [18]), that if the initial state $f_0(v) \in L^1_{(r_0,2)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then this property propagates uniformly in time in the following sense: $f(v,t) \in L^1_{(r,2)}(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$, with $0 < r \leq r_0$, for all time t, where r only depends on a number k'-moments of the initial state f_0, with $k' > 2$, as well as on the scattering kernel B (i.e. on the potential rate λ and the angular function $b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)$). We refer to [1] for a recent proof of this fact for the case where the angular cross section $b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma) \in L^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$.

Such property was first proven in [46] under the condition $b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma) \in L^{1+}(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$, where the authors have also shown the propagation of $f(v,t) \in L^\infty_{(\bar{r},2)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with $0 < \bar{r} \leq r \leq r_0$, for all time $t > 0$, if initially $f_0(v) \in L^\infty_{(r_0,2)}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f(v,t) \in L^1_{(r,2)}(\mathbb{R}^d_v)$, uniformly in time $t > 0$. As a consequence, one can surely state that for any given initial state $f_0 \in L^1_{e^{\alpha|v|^2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ or $f_0 \in L^\infty_{e^{\alpha|v|^2}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists a a rate $\beta = \beta(k'(f_0), \lambda, b)$, for which these exponentially weighted L^1 and L^∞ norms propagate uniformly in time.

This propagation property secures a stable numerical simulation of the Boltzmann equation, provided the numerical preserving the conservation laws or corresponding collision invariants hold. This property yields the convergence to the analytic solution of the initial value problem and its long time behavior converges to the equilibrium Maxwellian, as defined in (2.10).

As we shall prove in this manuscript that the proposed numerical approximation to the Boltzmann equation preserves the collision invariant properties that yield conservation of mass, mean and variance of its solutions, we are able to choose the computational domain $\Omega_L = (-L, L)^d$ sufficiently large such that, at least, most of the mass and energy of the solution f will be contained in it throughout the simulation. One possible strategy for choosing the size of Ω_L is as follows.

Assume, without loss of generality, a bounded initial datum f_0 with compact support and having zero momentum $\int f_0\, v = 0$. Then,

$$f_0(v) \leq \frac{C_0\, m_0}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d T_0}}\, e^{-\frac{r_0|v|^2}{2T_0}}\,, \tag{2.18}$$

where $m_0 := \int f_0$ is the initial mass, $T_0 := \int f_0|v|^2$ is the initial temperature, and $r_0 \in (0,1]$ and $C_0 \geq 1$ are the stretching and dilating constants. From the analytical results mentioned earlier, there is some $r := r(f_0, \lambda, b) \in (0, r_0]$ and $C := C(f_0, \lambda, b) \geq 1$

$$f(t,v) \leq \frac{C\, m_0}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d T_0}}\, e^{-\frac{r|v|^2}{2T_0}} =: M(f_0, C, r)\,, \quad t > 0\,. \tag{2.19}$$

A simple criteria to pick the segment length L of the simulation domain Ω_L is to ensure that most of the mass and energy of f will remain in it throughout the numerical simulation. In other words, this can be accomplished by choosing a small proportion $\mu \ll 1$, being the mass proportion of the tails associated to the Maxwellian $M(f_0, C, r)$ from (2.19) that uniformly controls the solution $f(v,t)$ uniformly in v-space and

time. That is

$$\int_{\Omega_L^c} f(v,t)\langle v\rangle^2 \mathrm{d}v \leq \int_{\Omega_L^c} M(f_0,C,r)\langle v\rangle^2 \mathrm{d}v \leq \mu \int_{\Omega_L} f_0(v)\langle v\rangle^2 \mathrm{d}v = \mu(m_0+T_0)\,.$$

where μ is chosen as a domain cut-off error tolerance that *remains uniform in time* and solely depends on the initial state and Ω_L. Clearly, the mass proportion μ must be small enough for $\mathrm{supp}(f_0) \subset \Omega_L$.

Equivalently, one needs to choose the size of L, (or the measure of the computational domain Ω_L), such that

$$\frac{\int_{\Omega_L^c} M(f_0,C,r)\langle v\rangle^2 \mathrm{d}v}{m_0+T_0} \leq \mu \approx 0\,. \tag{2.20}$$

In order to minimize the computational effort, one should pick the smallest of such domains, that is Ω_{L_*} with

$$L_* = \min\left\{L>0 \,:\, \mathrm{supp}(f_0)\subset\Omega_L\,,\, \Omega_L^c \text{ satisfaces (2.20)}\right\}. \tag{2.21}$$

Now, for the estimate (2.21) to be of practical use one needs to compute the precise value of the constants C and r. As a general matter, they are quite difficult to compute, furthermore, analytical estimates available, although quantitative, are likely far from optimal. The result is that the choice (2.21) most of the times overestimate the size of the simulation domain. It is reasonable then, for practical purposes, to simply set $r_o = r = 1$ and choose $C = C_o \geq 1$ as the smallest constant satisfying (2.18) (which always exists for any compactly supported and bounded f_0). That this choice of parameters is natural, it is noted from the fact that

$$\max\left\{f_0\,,\, f_\infty := \frac{m_o}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d T_o}}\, e^{-\frac{|v|^2}{2T_o}}\right\} \leq M(f_0,C,1)\,,$$

with equality if and only if f_0 is the equilibrium Maxwellian as in (2.10) (in such a case $C=1$).

Then, a simple use of the classical *Normal Table for log-normal distributions* yields the error μ incurred in the simulation as a function of the chosen Ω_L, uniformly in time, for any simulation of the Boltzmann collisional model homogeneous in x-space.

Remark 2.1. It was also shown in [1] that if the initial state $f_0 \in L^1_k(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the solution of the elastic homogeneous Boltzmann flow generates exponential norms $f \in L^1_{e^{\beta|v|^\lambda}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where the parameter λ is the collisional potential rate $0<\lambda\leq 1$ and $\beta = \beta(k'(f_0),\lambda,b)$.

Remark 2.2. In this deterministic approach, as much as with Montecarlo methods like the Bird scheme [8], the x-space inhomogeneous Hamiltonian transport for non-linear collisional forms are performed by time operator splitting algorithms. That means, depending on the problem, the computational v-domain Ω_L can be updated with respect to the characteristic flow associated to underlying Hamiltonian dynamics.

2.3 Fourier series, projections and extensions

In the implementation of any spectral method the single most important analytical tool is the Fourier transform. Thus, for $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the Fourier transform is defined by

$$\hat{f}(\zeta) := \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(v)e^{-i\zeta\cdot v}\mathrm{d}v\,. \tag{2.22}$$

The Fourier transform allow us to express the Fourier series in a rather simple and convenient way. Indeed, fixing a domain of work $\Omega_L := (-L, L)^d$ for $L > 0$, recall that for any $f \in L^2(\Omega_L)$ the *Fourier series* of f, denoted from now on by f_L is given by

$$f_L \sim \frac{1}{(2L)^d} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{f}_L(\zeta_k) e^{i\zeta_k \cdot v}, \tag{2.23}$$

where $\zeta_k := \frac{2\pi k}{L}$ are the spectral modes and $\hat{f}_L(\zeta_k)$ is the Fourier transform of f_L evaluated in such modes, that is,

$$\hat{f}_L(\zeta) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \int_{\Omega_L} f_L(v) e^{i\zeta \cdot v} \mathrm{d}v.$$

Define the operator $\Pi^N : L^2(\Omega_L) \to L^2(\Omega_L)$ as

$$\left(\Pi^N f_L\right)(v) := f_L^{\Pi}(v) = \left(\frac{1}{(2L)^d} \sum_{|k| \le N} \hat{f}_L(\zeta_k) e^{i\zeta_k \cdot v} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_L}(v), \tag{2.24}$$

that is, the *orthogonal projection* on the "first N" basis elements. Also observe that for any integer α the derivative operator commutes with the projection operator. In Ω_L

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^\alpha \left(\Pi^N f_L\right)(v) &= \left(\frac{1}{(2L)^d} \sum_{|k| \le N} (i\zeta_k)^\alpha \hat{f}_L(\zeta_k) e^{i\zeta_k \cdot v} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_L}(v) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{(2L)^d} \sum_{|k| \le N} \widehat{\partial^\alpha f}(\zeta_k) e^{i\zeta_k \cdot v} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_L}(v) = \left(\Pi^N \partial^\alpha f\right)(v). \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Recall that Parseval's theorem readily shows

1. $\left\|\Pi^N f_L\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le \left\|f_L\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}$ for any N; and
2. $\left\|\Pi^N f_L - f_L\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \searrow 0$ as $N \to \infty$.

The Extension Operator. For fixed $\alpha_0 \ge 0$ we introduce the *extension operator* $\mathrm{E} : L^2(\Omega_L) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\mathrm{E} : H^\alpha(\Omega_L) \to H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ holds for any $\alpha \le \alpha_0$. The construction of such operator [73] is well known and it is endowed with the following properties:

E1. Linear and bounded with

$$\|\mathrm{E}f\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C_\alpha \|f\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)} \quad \text{for } \alpha \le \alpha_0.$$

E2. $\mathrm{E}f = f$ a.e. in Ω_L. Furthermore, denoting $f^\pm$ the positive and negative parts of f one has

$$\left(\mathrm{E}f\right)^\pm = \mathrm{E}f^\pm, \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

E3. Outside Ω_L the extension is constructed using a reflexion of f near the boundary $\partial\Omega_L$. Thus, for any $\delta \ge 1$ we can choose an extension with support in $\delta\Omega_L$, the dilation of Ω_L by δ, and

$$\|\mathrm{E}f\|_{L^p(\delta\Omega_L \setminus \Omega_L)} \le C_0 \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega_L \setminus \delta^{-1}\Omega_L)} \quad \text{for } 1 \le p \le 2,$$

where the constant C_0 is independent of the support of the extension.

E4. In particular, properties E2. and E3. imply that for any $\delta \geq 1$ there is an extension such that

$$\|\mathrm{E}f\|_{L^p_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 2C_0\delta^{2k}\|f\|_{L^p_k(\Omega_L)} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq p \leq 2,\ k \geq 0.$$

Indeed, note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left|\mathrm{E}f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\right|^p \mathrm{d}v = \int_{\Omega_L} \left|f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\right|^p \mathrm{d}v + \int_{\delta\Omega_L\setminus\Omega_L} \left|\mathrm{E}f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\right|^p \mathrm{d}v.$$

Furthermore, for the second integral in the right-hand-side,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\delta\Omega_L\setminus\Omega_L} \left|\mathrm{E}f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\right|^p \mathrm{d}v \leq\ & \langle \delta L\rangle^{kp} \int_{\delta\Omega_L\setminus\Omega_L} \left|\mathrm{E}f(v)\right|^p \mathrm{d}v \\ &\leq C^p\langle \delta L\rangle^{kp} \int_{\Omega_L\setminus\delta^{-1}\Omega_L} \left|f(v)\right|^p \mathrm{d}v \leq C^p \frac{\langle \delta L\rangle^{kp}}{\langle \delta^{-1}L\rangle^{kp}} \int_{\Omega_L\setminus\delta^{-1}\Omega_L} \left|f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\right|^p \mathrm{d}v \\ &\leq C^p\delta^{2kp} \int_{\Omega_L\setminus\delta^{-1}\Omega_L} \left|f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\right|^p \mathrm{d}v.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left|\mathrm{E}f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\right|^p \mathrm{d}v \leq 2C^p\delta^{2kp} \int_{\Omega_L} \left|f(v)\langle v\rangle^k\right|^p \mathrm{d}v.$$

The case for $\delta = 1$ is only possible using the zero extension. That is, when $(Ef)(v) = f(v)1_{\Omega_L}(v)$ then $\alpha_0 = 0$.

3 Spectral conservation method

Allow us to motivate formally the spectral method used in this manuscript. After the cut-off domain Ω_L has been fixed, we apply the projection operator in both sides of equation (2.1) to arrive to

$$\frac{\partial \Pi^N f}{\partial t}(v,t) = \Pi^N Q(f,f)(v,t)\,, \quad \text{in} \quad (0,T]\times\Omega_L\,.$$

Then, it is reasonable to expect that for such a domain Ω_L and for sufficiently large number of modes N the approximation

$$\Pi^N Q(f,f) \sim \Pi^N Q(\Pi^N f, \Pi^N f)\,, \quad \text{in} \quad (0,T]\times\Omega_L$$

will be valid. That lead us to solve the problem

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t}(v,t) = \Pi^N Q(g,g)(v,t)\,, \quad \text{in} \quad (0,T]\times\Omega_L,$$

with initial condition $g_0 = \Pi^N f_0$, and expect that it should be a good approximation to $\Pi^N f$. In other words we define the numerical solution to be $g_N := g$ and expect to show that this discrete solution will be a good approximation to the solution of the Boltzmann problem in the cut-off domain, that is $g \approx f$ in Ω_L, provided the number of modes N used is sufficiently large.

In the following section we intent to prove this formalism under reasonable assumptions. In fact, we study a modification of this problem, namely, the convergence towards f of the solution g of the problem

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t}(v,t) = Q_c(g)(v,t) \quad \text{in} \quad (0,T]\times\Omega_L, \tag{3.1}$$

with initial condition $g_0 := g_0^N = \Pi^N f_0$. The operator $Q_c(g)$ is defined as the $L^2(\Omega_L)$-closest function to $\Pi^N Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g)$ having null mass, momentum and energy. Since the gain collision operator is global in velocity, it turns out that a good approximation to f will be obtained as long as Ω_L and N are sufficiently large. The extension operator E has a subtle job to do in the approximation scheme which is related precisely to the global behavior of the gain collision operator. Since solutions of the approximation problem (3.1) lie in Ω_L, they are truncated versions of f. The gain operator does not possess higher derivatives *in* Ω_L when acting on truncated functions due to the singularity created in the boundary $\partial\Omega_L$. The extension smooths out the gain collision operator at the price of extending the domain. In the case of discontinuous solutions where only L^2-error estimate is expected, the correct extension to use in the scheme is the extension by zero. We discuss this more carefully in the following sections.

We are now in position to start the to construct building blocks for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3.1 Conservation Method - An Extended Isoperimetric problem

Throughout this section we fix $f \in L^2(\Omega_L)$. Due to the truncation of the velocity domain the projection of $Q(f,f)$, namely $\Pi^N Q(f,f)$, does not preserve mass, momentum and energy. Such conservation property is at the heart of the kinetic theory of the Boltzmann equation, thus it is desirable for a numerical solution to possess it. In order to achieve this, we enforce these moment conservation artificially by imposing them as constraints in a optimization problem. We denote, for the sake of brevity,

$$Q_u(f)(v) := \Pi^N \big(Q(\mathrm{E}f, \mathrm{E}f)\, \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_L}\big)(v). \tag{3.2}$$

The presence of the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_L}(v)$ is due to the fact that the domain of $Q(\mathrm{E}f, \mathrm{E}f)$ will be, in general, larger than Ω_L. We also use the extension operator to avoid introducing spurious non-smoothness within the domain Ω_L due to the domain cut-off.

Elastic Problem (E): Minimize in the Banach space

$$\mathcal{B}^e = \left\{ X \in L^2(\Omega_L) : \int_{\Omega_L} X = \int_{\Omega_L} Xv = \int_{\Omega_L} X|v|^2 = 0 \right\},$$

the functional

$$\mathcal{A}^e(X) := \int_{\Omega_L} \big(Q_u(f)(v) - X\big)^2 \mathrm{d}v. \tag{3.3}$$

In other words, minimize the L^2-distance to the projected collision operator subject to mass, momentum and energy conservation.

Lemma 3.1 (Elastic Lagrange Estimate)**.** *The problem* (3.6) *has a unique minimizer given by*

$$Q_c(f)(v) := X^\star = Q_u(f)(v) - \frac{1}{2}\Big(\gamma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1} v_j + \gamma_{d+2}|v|^2\Big), \tag{3.4}$$

where γ_j, for $1 \leq j \leq d+2$, are Lagrange multipliers associated with the elastic optimization problem. Furthermore, they are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= O_d \rho_u + O_{d+2} e_u \,, \\ \gamma_{j+1} &= O_{d+2} \mu_u^j \,, \quad j = 1, 2, \cdots, d, \\ \gamma_{d+2} &= O_{d+2} \rho_u + O_{d+4} e_u \,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The parameters ρ_u, e_u, μ_u^j are the numerical moments of the unconserved numerical collision operator, defined below in (3.10)*, and $O_r := O(L^{-r})$ only depends inversely on $|\Omega_L|$. In particular, the minimization problem*

$$\min_{X \in \mathcal{B}^e} \mathcal{A}^e(X) := \min_{X \in \mathcal{B}^e} \int_{\Omega_L} \big(Q_u(f)(v) - X\big)^2 dv. \tag{3.6}$$

has a unique solution denoted $X^\star =: Q_c(f)(v)$ that defines the approximate conserved collision operator, and the the minimized objective function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^e(Q_c(f)(v)) = \; & \|Q_u(f) - Q_c(f)(v)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ & \leq C(d)\Big(2\gamma_1^2 L^d + (\sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1}^2) L^{d+2} + \gamma_{d+2}^2 L^{d+4}\Big) dv \\ & \leq \frac{C(d)}{L^d} \left(\rho_u^2 + \frac{e_u^2}{L^{d+1}} + \sum_{j=2}^{d+1} \mu_j^2 \right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where a, b, c and d are constants that depend of the space dimension d.

In the particular case of dimension $d = 3$ the estimate becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_u(f) - Q_c(f)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &= 2\gamma_1^2 L^3 + \frac{2}{3}\left(\sum_{j=2}^{4} \gamma_j^2\right) L^5 + 4\gamma_1\gamma_d L^5 + \frac{38}{15}\gamma_5^2 \, L^7 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{L^3}\left(\rho_u^2 + \frac{e_u^2}{L^4} + \sum_{j=2}^{4} \mu_j^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. From calculus of variations when the objective function is an integral equation and the constraints are integrals, the optimization problem can be solved by forming the Lagrangian functional and finding its critical points. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_1(X) :&= \int_{\Omega_L} X(v) \mathrm{d}v \,, \\ \psi_{j+1}(X) :&= \int_{\Omega_L} v_j X(v) \mathrm{d}v \,, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \cdots, d, \\ \psi_{d+2}(X) :&= \int_{\Omega_L} |v|^2 X(v) \mathrm{d}v \,, \end{aligned}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{H}(X, X', \boldsymbol{\gamma}) := \mathcal{A}^e(X) + \sum_{i=1}^{d+2} \gamma_i \psi_i(X) = \int_{\Omega_L} h(v, X, X', \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathrm{d}v.$$

We introduced

$$h(v, X, X', \boldsymbol{\gamma}) := \big(Q_u(f)(v) - X(v)\big)^2 + \gamma_1 X(v) + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1} v_j X(v) + \gamma_{d+2}|v|^2 X(v).$$

In order to find the critical points one needs to compute $D_X\mathcal{H}$ and $D_{\gamma_j}\mathcal{H}$. The derivatives $D_{\gamma_j}\mathcal{H}$ just retrieves the constraint integrals. For multiple independent variables v_j and a single dependent function $X(v)$ the Euler-Lagrange equations are

$$D_2 h(v, X, X', \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} \frac{\partial D_3 h}{\partial v_j}(v, X, X', \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = 0\,.$$

We used the fact that h is independent of X'. This gives the following equation for the conservation correction in terms of the Lagrange multipliers

$$2\big(X(v) - Q_u(f)(v)\big) + \gamma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1} v_j + \gamma_{d+2}|v|^2 = 0,$$

$$\text{and therefore,}\quad Q_c(f)(v) = X^\star(v) := Q_u(f)(v) - \frac{1}{2}\Big(\gamma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1} v_j + \gamma_{d+2}|v|^2\Big). \tag{3.9}$$

Let $g(v, \gamma) = \gamma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1} v_j + \gamma_{d+2}|v|^2$. Substituting (3.9) into the constraints $\psi_j(X^\star) = 0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_u &:= \int_{\Omega_L} Q_u(f)(v)\mathrm{d}v = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_L} g(v, \gamma)\mathrm{d}v \\
\mu_u^j &:= \int_{\Omega_L} v_j Q_u(f)(v)\mathrm{d}v = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_L} v_j g(v, \gamma)\mathrm{d}v, \qquad j = 1, 2, \cdots, d, \\
e_u &:= \int_{\Omega_L} |v|^2 Q_u(f)(v)\mathrm{d}v = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_L} |v|^2 g(v, \gamma)\mathrm{d}v\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Identities (3.10) form a system of $d+2$ linear equations with $d+2$ unknown variables that can be uniquely solved. Solving for the critical γ_j,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_1 &= O_d \rho_u + O_{d+2} e_u\,, \\
\gamma_{j+1} &= O_d \mu_u^j\,, \qquad j = 1, 2, \cdots, d, \\
\gamma_{d+2} &= O_{d+2}\rho_u + O_{d+4} e_u\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where $O_r = O(L^{-r})$. In particular, O_r depends inversely on $|\Omega_L|$. Hence, relation (3.5) holds.

Substituting these values of critical Lagrange multipliers (3.11) into (3.9) gives explicitly the critical $Q_c(f)(v) := X^\star(v)$. Moreover, the objective function $\mathcal{A}^e(X)$ can be computed at its minimum as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}^e(Q_c(f)) = \|Q_u(f) - Q_c(f)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &= \int_{\Omega_L} \big(Q_u(f)(v) - X^\star(v)\big)^2 \mathrm{d}v \\
&= \frac{1}{4}\int_{\Omega_L} \Big(\gamma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1} v_j + \gamma_{d+2}|v|^2\Big)^2 \mathrm{d}v \\
&\le \frac{d+2}{4}\int_{\Omega_L} \Big(\gamma_1^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} (\gamma_{j+1} v_j)^2 + \gamma_{d+2}^2 |v|^4\Big)\mathrm{d}v \\
&\le C(d)\Big(2\gamma_1^2 L^d + (\sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1}^2) L^{d+2} + \gamma_{d+2}^2 L^{d+4}\Big)\mathrm{d}v\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $C(d)$ is an universal constant depending on the dimension of the space. Hence, using the relation (3.11) to replace into the right hand side of (3.12) with $O_r = O(L^{-r})$, yields a bound from above to the difference of the conserved and unconserved approximating collision operators

$$\|Q_u(f) - Q_c(f)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq \frac{C(d)}{L^d}\left(\rho_u^2 + \frac{e_u^2}{L^{d+1}} + \sum_{j=2}^{d+1}\mu_j^2\right), \tag{3.13}$$

and therefore, the lagrage estimate (3.7) holds.

Upon simplification one can obtain a ore detailed estimate for the 3-dimensional case, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\|Q_u(f) - Q_c(f)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &= 2\gamma_1^2 L^3 + \frac{2}{3}(\gamma_2^2+\gamma_3^2+\gamma_4^2)L^5 + 4\gamma_1\gamma_5 L^5 + \frac{38}{15}\gamma_5^2 L^7 \\ &\leq \frac{C}{L^3}\left(\rho_u^2 + \frac{e_u^2}{L^4} + \sum_{j=2}^{4}\mu_j^2\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

which is precisely (3.8). That this critical point is in fact the unique minimizer follows from the strict convexity of $\mathcal{A}^e$. □

Similarly, we can form the optimization problem for the inelastic case.

Inelastic Problem (IE): Minimize in the Banach space

$$\mathcal{B}^i = \left\{X \in L^2(\Omega_L) : \int_{\Omega_L} X = \int_{\Omega_L} Xv = 0\right\},$$

the functional

$$\mathcal{A}^i(X) := \int_{\Omega_L}\big(Q_u(f)(v) - X\big)^2 \mathrm{d}v. \tag{3.15}$$

As in the Elastic case, we can also obtain a similar Lagrange estimate for the inelastic collision law.

Lemma 3.2 (Inelastic Lagrange Estimate)**.** *The problem* (3.15) *has a unique minimizer given by*

$$Q_c^{ine}(f)(v) := X^\star(v) = Q_u(f)(v) - \frac{1}{2}\Big(\gamma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d}\gamma_{j+1}v_j\Big). \tag{3.16}$$

The γ_j are Lagrange multipliers associated with the inelastic *optimization problem given by*

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_1 &= O_d\rho_u\,, \\ \gamma_{j+1} &= O_{d+2}\mu_u^j\,, \quad j = 1, 2, \cdots, d\,,\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where $O_r = O(L^{-r})$, that is, depending inversely on $|\Omega_L|$. In particular, for the three dimensional case the minimized objective function is

$$\mathcal{A}^i(X^\star) = \|Q_u(f) - Q_c^{ine}(f)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} = 2\gamma_1^2 L^3 + \frac{2}{3}\big(\gamma_2^2+\gamma_3^2+\gamma_4^2\big)L^5\,. \tag{3.18}$$

Conservation Correction Estimates. In order to analyze the convergence and error by the proposed Spectral-Lagrange constrained minimization problem, we need to develop estimates for the unconserved moments ρ_u, μ_u^j and e_u as well as estimates for the moments of differences between the unconserved and conserved discrete collisional forms. We recall the classical definition of moments associated to probability densities.

Definition. For any fixed $f \in L^2(\Omega_L)$ the *conserved projection operator* $Q_c(f)$ is defined as the minimizer of problem (E) defined by (3.4)(or problem (IE) in the inelastic case defined by (3.16)).

Note that the minimized objective function (3.7) in the elastic optimization problem depends only on the non conserved moments ρ_u, μ_u^j, and e_u of $Q_u(f)$. Since these quantities are expected to be approximations to zero, then the conserved projection operator is a perturbation of $Q_u(f)$ by a second order polynomial in the elastic case. Similarly, it is a perturbation by a first order polynomial in the inelastic case.

In the sequel, following the notation and language of the classical analysis of the non-linear Boltzmann equation, the *moments of a probability density function* f are denoted by

$$m_k(f) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|f(v)\big|\,|v|^{\lambda k}\,\mathrm{d}v. \tag{3.19}$$

Theorem 3.3 (Conservation Correction Estimate)**.** *Fix $f \in L^2(\Omega_L)$, then the accuracy of the conservation minimization problem is proportional to the spectral accuracy. That is, for any $k, k' \geq 0$ and $\delta > 1$ there exists an extension E such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\| \left(Q_c(f) - Q_u(f)\right)|v|^{\lambda k}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{k+d}} L^{\lambda k} \|Q(Ef, Ef) - Q_u(f)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ + \frac{\delta^{2\lambda k'}}{\sqrt{k+d}} O_{(d/2+\lambda(k'-k))}\big(m_{k'+1}(f)m_0(f) + Z_{k'}(f)\big),\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where C is a universal constant and $Z_{k'}(f)$ is defined by

$$Z_k(f) := \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \begin{pmatrix} k \\ j \end{pmatrix} m_{j+1}(f) m_{k-j}(f). \tag{3.21}$$

depending on the moments up to order k' (See also Appendix (8.3)*) .*

Proof. Using lemma 3.1 for elastic interactions, given a $0 \geq k \in \mathbb{R}$, estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\| \left(Q_c(f) - Q_u(f)\right)|v|^{\lambda k}\Big\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &= \Big\| \frac{1}{2}\Big(\gamma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \gamma_{j+1} v_j + \gamma_{d+2}|v|^2\Big)|v|^{\lambda k}\Big\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ &\leq \frac{CL^{\lambda k}}{\sqrt{k+d}} \left(|\gamma_1| L^{d/2} + |\gamma_j| L^{1+d/2} + |\gamma_{d+2}| L^{2+d/2}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Next, for any $f \in L^2(\Omega_L)$, the Lagrange multipliers γ_j, $1 \leq j \leq d+2$, can be computed as follows: the collision operator $Q(\mathrm{E}f, \mathrm{E}f)$ acting on the Extension of f, has, in general, support larger than Ω_L. Then,

for $\psi(v)$ being a collision invariant, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\psi = 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_{\Omega_L} Q_u(f)(v)\psi(v)\mathrm{d}v\Big| =& \\ \Big|\int_{\Omega_L}\big(Q_u(f)(v) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)(v)\big)\psi(v)\mathrm{d}v - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega_L} Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)(v)\psi(v)\mathrm{d}v\Big| & \\ \leq \|Q_u(f) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + I_\psi. & \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

for I_ψ defined by

$$I_\psi := \Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega_L} Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)(v)\psi(v)dv\Big|. \tag{3.24}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\|1\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &\sim L^{d/2}\,,\\ \|v_j\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &\sim L^{d/2+1}, \quad \text{for } \ j = 1,2,3,...,d\,,\\ \||v|^2\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &\sim L^{d/2+2}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

then, for $\psi = 1, v^j, |v|^2$ with $j = 1,2,\dots d$ the corresponding estimate (3.23) combined with (3.25) yield the following estimates to the unconserved moments defined in (3.10)

$$\begin{aligned}|\rho_u| &\leq CL^{d/2}\|Q_u(f) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + I_1\,,\\ |\mu_u^j| &\leq CL^{d/2+1}\|Q_u(f) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + I_{v_j}, \quad j = 1,2,3,...d\,,\\ |e_u| &\leq CL^{d/2+2}\|Q_u(f) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\|_{L^2B(\Omega_L)} + I_{|v|^2}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Therefore, using (3.26) in (3.11) Lagrange multipliers are estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}|\gamma_1| &= O_{d/2}\|Q_u(f) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_d I_1 + O_{d+2} I_{|v|^2},\\ |\gamma_j| &= O_{d/2+1}\|Q_u(f) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d+2} I_{v_j}, \quad j = 1,2,3,...d\,,\\ |\gamma_{d+2}| &= O_{d/2+2}\|Q_u(f) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d+2} I_1 + O_{d+4} I_{|v|^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Finally, the Lagrangian critical parameters from (3.22) are estimated by (3.27) to yield

$$\begin{aligned}\|(Q_c(f) - Q_u(f))|v|^{\lambda k}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} = \frac{C}{\sqrt{k+d}}\Big(&L^{\lambda k}\|Q_u(f) - Q(\mathrm{E}f,\mathrm{E}f)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\\ &+ O_{d/2-\lambda k} I_1 + O_{d/2+1-\lambda k} I_{v_j} + O_{d/2+2-\lambda k} I_{|v|^2}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

In order to estimate the second term in the above inequality, the terms I_ψ define in (3.24) are estimated combining classical moment estimates for binary collisional integrals for elastic interactions, with hard potentials of order $\lambda \in [0,2]$ in their scattering cross sections shown in Theorem 8.2 in the appendix, with property 4 of section 2.3 for the extensions of function in Sobolev spaces. In particular, for any $0 \geq k' \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \in [0,2]$ and $\delta > 1$, there exists a E such that

$$\begin{aligned}\max\{I_1, L^{-1}I_{v_j}, L^{-2}I_{|v|^2}\} &\leq CL^{-\lambda k'}\big(m_{k'+1}(\mathrm{E}f)\; m_0(\mathrm{E}f) + Z_{k'}(\mathrm{E}f)\big)\\ &\leq C\delta^{2\lambda k'}L^{-\lambda k'}\big(m_{k'+1}(f)\; m_0(f) + Z_{k'}(f)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, a simple calculation shows

$$O_{d/2-\lambda k}I_1 + O_{d/2+1-\lambda k}I_{v_j} + O_{d/2+2-\lambda k}I_{|v|^2} = \delta^{2\lambda k'}O_{d/2+\lambda(k'-k)}\big(m_{k'+1}(f)m_0(f) + Z_{k'}(f)\big),$$

and so inequality (3.22) holds.

This estimate also follows for the *Inelastic collisions* case. Their computations follow in a similar fashion using lemma 3.2, the Lagrange multipliers (3.17) and the first two inequalities in (3.26). □

3.2 Discrete in Time Conservation Method: Lagrange Multiplier Method

In this subsection we consider the discrete version of the conservation scheme. For such a discrete formulation, the conservation routine is implemented as a Lagrange multiplier method where the conservation properties of the discrete distribution are set as constraints. Let $M = N^d$, the total number of Fourier modes. For elastic collisions, $\rho = 0$, $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \cdots, m_d) = (0, \cdots, 0)$ and $e = 0$ are conserved, whereas for inelastic collisions, $\rho = 0$ and $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \cdots, m_d) = (0, \cdots, 0)$ are conserved. Let $\omega_j > 0$ be the integration weights for $1 \le j \le M$ and define

$$\mathbf{Q}_u = \begin{pmatrix} Q_{u,1} & Q_{u,2} & \cdots & Q_{u,M} \end{pmatrix}^T$$

as the distribution vector at the computed time step, and

$$\mathbf{Q}_c = \begin{pmatrix} Q_{c,1} & Q_{c,2} & \cdots & Q_{c,M} \end{pmatrix}^T$$

as the corrected distribution vector with the required moments conserved. For the elastic case, let

$$\mathbf{C}^e_{(d+2)\times M} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_j \\ v_1\,\omega_j \\ \cdots \\ v_d\,\omega_j \\ |v_j|^2\,\omega_j \end{pmatrix} \quad 1 \le j \le M\,,$$

be the integration matrix, and

$$\mathbf{a}^e_{(d+2)\times 1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\rho & \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}m_1 & \cdots & \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}m_d & \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}e \end{pmatrix}^T$$

be the vector of conserved quantities. With this notation in mind, the discrete conservation method can be written as a constrained optimization problem: Find $\mathbf{Q}_c$ such that is the unique solutions of

$$\mathcal{A}\big(\mathbf{Q}_c\big) = \big\{\min\|\mathbf{Q}_u - \mathbf{Q}_c\|_2^2 : \mathbf{C}^e\mathbf{Q}_c = \mathbf{a}^e \text{ with } \mathbf{C}^e \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2\times M},\, \mathbf{Q}_u \in \mathbb{R}^M,\, \mathbf{a}^e \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2}\big\}\,.$$

To solve $\mathcal{A}\big(\mathbf{Q}_c\big)$, one can employ the Lagrange multiplier method. Let $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2}$ be the Lagrange multiplier vector. Then the scalar objective function to be optimized is given by

$$\mathrm{L}\big(\mathbf{Q}_c, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\big) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \big|Q_{u,j} - Q_{c,j}\big|^2 + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T(\mathbf{C}^e\mathbf{Q}_c - \mathbf{a}^e)\,. \tag{3.28}$$

Equation (3.28) can be solved explicitly for the corrected distribution value and the resulting equation of correction be implemented numerically in the code. Indeed, taking the derivative of $\mathrm{L}\big(\mathbf{Q}_c, \boldsymbol{\gamma}\big)$ with respect to $Q_{c,j}$, for $1 \le j \le M$ and γ_i, for $1 \le i \le d+2$

$$\frac{\partial \mathrm{L}}{\partial Q_{c,j}} = 0\,, \quad j = 1, \cdots, M \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{Q}_c = \mathbf{Q}_u + \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{C}^e)^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}\,. \tag{3.29}$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial \mathrm{L}}{\partial \gamma_i} = , \quad i = 1, \cdots, d+2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{C}^e \mathbf{Q}_c = \mathbf{a}^e\,,$$

retrieves the constraints. Solving for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$,

$$\mathbf{C}^e(\mathbf{C}^e)^T \boldsymbol{\gamma} = 2(\mathbf{a}^e - \mathbf{C}^e \mathbf{Q}_u)\,. \tag{3.30}$$

Now $\mathbf{C}^e(\mathbf{C}^e)^T$ is symmetric and, because $\mathbf{C}^e$ is an integration matrix, it is also positive definite. As a consequence, the inverse of $\mathbf{C}^e(\mathbf{C}^e)^T$ exists and one can compute the value of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ simply by

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} = 2(\mathbf{C}^e(\mathbf{C}^e)^T)^{-1}(\mathbf{a}^e - \mathbf{C}^e \mathbf{Q}_u)\,.$$

Substituting $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ into (3.29) and recalling that $\mathbf{a}^e = \mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_c &= \mathbf{Q}_u + (\mathbf{C}^e)^T \big(\mathbf{C}^e(\mathbf{C}^e)^T\big)^{-1}(\mathbf{a}^e - \mathbf{C}^e \mathbf{Q}_u) \\ &= \Big[\mathbb{I} - (\mathbf{C}^e)^T \big(\mathbf{C}^e(\mathbf{C}^e)^T\big)^{-1} \mathbf{C}^e\Big]\, \mathbf{Q}_u \\ &=: \Lambda_N(\mathbf{C}^e)\, \mathbf{Q}_u\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

where $\mathbb{I} = N \times N$ identity matrix. In the sequel, we regard this conservation routine as *Conserve*. Thus,

$$Conserve(\mathbf{Q}_u) = \mathbf{Q}_c = \Lambda_N(\mathbf{C}^e)\ \mathbf{Q}_u\,. \tag{3.32}$$

Define D_t to be any time discretization operator of arbitrary order. Then, the discrete problem that we solve reads

$$D_t \mathbf{f} = \Lambda_N(\mathbf{C}^e)\, \mathbf{Q}_u\,. \tag{3.33}$$

Thus, multiplying (3.33) by $\mathbf{C}^e$ it follows the conservation of observables

$$D_t\big(\mathbf{C}^e \mathbf{f}\big) = \mathbf{C}^e D_t \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{C}^e \Lambda_N(\mathbf{C}^e)\, \mathbf{Q}_u = 0\,, \tag{3.34}$$

where we used the commutation $\mathbf{C}^e D_t = D_t \mathbf{C}^e$ valid since $\mathbf{C}^e$ is independent of time, see [48] for additional comments.

4 Local existence, convergence and regularity of the scheme

In this section we prove L^1_k and L^2_k estimates for the approximation solutions $\{g_N\}$ of the problem (3.1) in the elastic case. For this purpose, we use several well known results that require different integrability properties

for the angular kernel b. Thus, we will work with a bounded b to avoid as much technicalities as possible and remarking that a generalization for $b \in L^1(\mathbb{S}^{d-1})$ can be made at the cost of technical work [1; 5; 66]. For technical reasons this assumption helps since estimates for the gain part of the collision operator become bilinear, that is, the role of the inputs can be interchanged without essentially altering the constants in the estimates. We also restrict ourselves to the case of variable hard potentials and hard spheres $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ and remark than the theory for Maxwell molecules $\lambda = 0$ needs a slightly different approach.

Recall that we have imposed conservation of mass, momentum and energy by building the operator $Q_c(g)$ with a constrained minimization procedure. Thus,

$$\int_{\Omega_L} g(v,t)\psi(v)\mathrm{d}v = \int_{\Omega_L} g_0(v)\psi(v)\mathrm{d}v$$

for any collision invariant $\psi(v) = \{1, v, |v|^2\}$. However, due to velocity truncation, the approximating solution g in general may be negative in some small portions of the domain. This is precisely the technical difficulty that we have to overcome. In the first subsection we prove convergence in the number of modes N in a time interval $(0, T(L)]$ where $T(L)$ is a time depending on the lateral size L of the velocity domain Ω_L. We find a control, in terms of L, on the negative mass that can be formed in such interval. In the second and third subsections, we improve the estimates assuming that the approximating solutions behaves well, that is, its negative mass does not increases too fast in the time interval in question.

4.1 Local existence and convergence

The natural space to study the spectral scheme is $L^2\big(\Omega_L\big)$, thus, we start proving that the problem is well posed in this space. Due to velocity truncation, we do not have the standard *a priori* estimates in L^1 that help in the theory, however, the constrain method permits to extend the time where the scheme gives an accurate solution of the original Boltzmann problem.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $g_0 \in L^2(\Omega_L)$ and fix the domain $(0, T(L)] \times \Omega_L$ with*

$$T(L) \sim \frac{1}{L^{d+2(\lambda+1)}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}}.$$

The following holds:

(1) The approximating problem (3.1) has a unique solution $g \in \mathcal{C}\big(0, T(L); L^2(\Omega_L)\big)$ with initial condition g_0 [1].

(2) Define the approximating sequence $\{g_N\}$ with the solutions of (3.1) with initial condition $g_{oN} = \Pi^N g_0$. Then, $\{g_N\}$ converges strongly in $\mathcal{C}\big(0, T(L); L^2(\Omega_L)\big)$ as $N \to \infty$. In particular,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T(L)]} \|Q(Eg_N, Eg_N) - Q_u(g_N)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \to 0 \text{ as } N \to 0, \tag{4.1}$$

[1] Note that g actually depends on N since Q_c depends on N. We omit this dependence to ease notation.

and the strong limit $\bar{g}$ is the unique solution of the equation

$$\frac{\partial \bar{g}}{\partial t} = Q(E\bar{g}, E\bar{g})\mathbf{1}_{\Omega_L} - \frac{1}{2}\Big(\bar{\gamma}_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \bar{\gamma}_{j+1} v_j + \bar{\gamma}_{d+2}|v|^2\Big), \quad \bar{g}(0) = g_0. \tag{4.2}$$

The coefficients of the quadratic polynomial are given in Lemma 3.1 with parameters (3.10) *evaluated at $Q(E\bar{g}, E\bar{g})$.*

(3) Furthermore, the negative mass of g is quantified as

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T(L)]} \|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} = \|g_0^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d/2+\lambda+2}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. Point (1) of the proposition follows in a standard fashion by a fix point argument for the operator

$$\mathcal{T}(g)(t) = g_0 + \int_0^t Q_c(g)(s)\mathrm{d}s.$$

Regarding point (2), fix a domain $(0,T]\times\Omega_L$ and take $\{g_N\}$ solutions of problem (3.1) for $g_{oN} = \Pi^N f_0 \in L^2(\Omega_L)$. Using Theorem 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g_N(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq& \|g_{oN}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + \int_0^t \|Q_c(g_N)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s \\
\leq& \|g_{oN}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + C\int_0^t \|Q(\mathrm{E}g_N, \mathrm{E}g_N)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s + O_{d/2}\int_0^t m_1(g_N)\, m_0(g_N)\,\mathrm{d}s \\
\leq& \|g_{oN}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + CL^{d/2+\lambda}\int_0^t \|g_N\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Gronwall's lemma

$$\|g_N(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq \frac{\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}}{1 - CL^{d/2+\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}t}. \tag{4.4}$$

Choose $T = \big(2CL^{d/2+\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\big)^{-1}$, then

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|g(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq 2\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}. \tag{4.5}$$

That is, the L^2-norm of the approximating sequence $\{g_N\}$ remains uniformly bounded in N for small $T := T(L)$. In particular, the sequence $\{g_N\}$ is converging weakly in $\mathcal{C}\big(0,T;L^2(\Omega_L)\big)$. In fact, it converges strongly. To see this, note that for any $N, M > 0$ and $t \in [0,T]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g_N(t) - g_M(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq \|\Pi^N g_0 - \Pi^M g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &+ \int_0^t \|Q_u(g_N) - Q_u(g_M)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s \\
&+ \int_0^t \|Q_c(g_N) - Q_u(g_N) - \big(Q_c(g_M) - Q_u(g_M)\big)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The first integral is controlled using Young's inequality for the full collision operator Q and the properties of the extension operator

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Q_u(g_N) - Q_u(g_M)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &\leq CL^{\lambda}\|g_N + g_M\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}\|g_N - g_M\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\
&\leq CL^{d/2+\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|g_N - g_M\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, Gronwall's lemma implies

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|g_N-g_M\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\leq e^{L^{d/2+\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}T}\times$$
$$\left(\|g_{oN}-g_{oM}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}+\int_0^T\|Q_c(g_N)-Q_u(g_N)-\big(Q_c(g_M)-Q_u(g_M)\big)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s\right). \quad (4.6)$$

Recall from lemma 3.1 that $Q_c(g)-Q_u(g)$ is a quadratic polynomial with coefficients depending on $\rho_u:=\rho_u^N$, $\mu_u:=\mu_u^N$ and $e_u:=e_u^N$. Clearly, the fact that $\{g_N\}$ converges weakly in $\mathcal{C}\big(0,T;L^2(\Omega_L)\big)$ implies that such coefficients converge pointwise in $[0,T]$ and, thus, the polynomial converges strongly in $\mathcal{C}(0,T;L^2(\Omega_L))$. Therefore,

$$\int_0^T\|Q_c(g_N)-Q_u(g_N)-\big(Q_c(g_M)-Q_u(g_M)\big)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s\to 0 \ \text{ as } \ N,M\to\infty.$$

This observation together with (4.6) proves that the sequence $\{g_N\}$ is Cauchy in $\mathcal{C}(0,T;L^2(\Omega_L))$ and, therefore, strongly convergent. The collision operator Q and the projection Q_u are sequentially continuous, then (4.1) and (4.2) follow.

The uniqueness statement of the limit $\bar{g}$ is proved by taking 2 solutions $\bar{g}_1$ and $\bar{g}_2$. Calling $\mathrm{p}(\bar{g}_1)$ and $\mathrm{p}(\bar{g}_2)$ the corrective quadratic polynomials of $\bar{g}_1$ and $\bar{g}_2$ respectively, one has by (3.11)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big|\mathrm{p}(\bar{g}_1)-\mathrm{p}(\bar{g}_2)\big|\mathrm{d}v\leq O_d\left(|\rho_u^1-\rho_u^2|+L^{-1}|\mu_u^1-\mu_u^2|+L^{-2}|e_u^1-e_u^2|\right)$$
$$\leq O_{d-2\lambda}\|\bar{g}_1-\bar{g}_2\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}\|\bar{g}_1+\bar{g}_2\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}\leq O_{d/2-2\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|\bar{g}_1-\bar{g}_2\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}.$$

Standard estimates for the collision and extension operators give similar estimate for the collision operator

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|Q(\mathrm{E}\bar{g}_1,\mathrm{E}\bar{g}_1)-Q(\mathrm{E}\bar{g}_2,\mathrm{E}\bar{g}_2)|\mathrm{d}v\leq O_{d/2-2\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|\bar{g}_1-\bar{g}_2\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}.$$

Using equation (4.2) and finite mass and energy for $\bar{g}_1$ and $\bar{g}_2$ leads to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\bar{g}_1-\bar{g}_2\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}\leq O_{d/2-2\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|\bar{g}_1-\bar{g}_2\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}.$$

Using Gronwall's lemma the uniqueness follows. In order to quantify the negative mass for a solution g for item (3) write $g=g^+-g^-$, where the $\pm$ signs denote the positive and negative parts of g respectively. Let us start with the equality

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t}=Q_c(g)-Q_u(g)+Q_u(g)-Q(g,g)+Q(g,g)=:I_1+Q(g,g).$$

Then, multiplying this equation by $g^-=1_{\{g\leq 0\}}g$

$$\frac{\partial(g^-)^2}{\partial t}=I_1\mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}g+Q(g,g)\mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}g,\quad I_1:=Q_c(g)-Q_u(g)+Q_u(g)-Q(g,g). \quad (4.7)$$

Note that

$$Q^+(g,g)\mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}(v)g=\big(Q^+(g^+,g^+)+Q^+(g^+,g^-)+Q^+(g^-,g^+)+Q^+(g^-,g^-)\big)\,\mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}g$$
$$\leq\big(Q^+(g^+,g^-)+Q^+(g^-,g^+)\big)\,\mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}g.$$

Therefore, integrating in velocity the inequality in (4.22)

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|g^-\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le \|I_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ + \|Q^+(g^+,g^-)+Q^+(g^-,g^+)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + \left|\int_{\Omega_L} Q^-(g,g)1_{\{g\le 0\}}g\,\mathrm{d}v\right|. \tag{4.8}$$

Using Theorem 3.3 one has

$$\|I_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le C\|Q(Eg,Eg)-Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + CL^{d/2+\lambda}\|g_0\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)}. \tag{4.9}$$

In addition, standard estimates for the positive part of the collision operator imply

$$\|Q^+(g^+,g^-)+Q^+(g^-,g^+)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ \le CL^\lambda\|g\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le CL^{d/2+\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}.$$

Meanwhile, for the negative part one has

$$\left|\int_{\Omega_L} Q^-(g,g)1_{\{g\le 0\}}g\,\mathrm{d}v\right| \le CL^\lambda\|g\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}\|g^-\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le CL^{d/2+\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|g^-\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)}.$$

Putting all together in inequality (4.8)

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le \|I_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + CL^{d/2+\lambda}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}.$$

Integrating in $[0,T]$ and using (4.9) gives

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le \|g_0^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + 2\int_0^T \|I_1\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s \\ \le \|g_0^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d/2+\lambda+2}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + 2C\int_0^T \|Q(Eg,Eg)-Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s.$$

In addition, choosing $T := T(L) = \left(CL^{d+2(\lambda+1)}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right)^{-1}$

$$\int_0^T \|Q(Eg,Eg)-Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\mathrm{d}s \le CL^{d/2+\lambda}\|g\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)}T = O_{d/2+\lambda+2}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}.$$

This shows the estimate for the negative mass of g. □

Remark 4.2. Using the strong L^2-convergence of Fourier series $g_{oN} \to g_0$ as $N \to \infty$

$$\|g_{oN}^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \to \|g_0^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} = 0, \quad N \to \infty.$$

Using this limit in item (3) proves the control on the negative mass of $\bar{g}$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T(L)]}\|\bar{g}^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} = O_{d/2+\lambda+2}\|g_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}.$$

4.2 Uniform propagation of moments

In the analysis of the following two sections, we assume that a solution $g \in \mathcal{C}\big(0,T;L^2(\Omega_L)\big)$ for problem (3.1) with initial condition $g_0 \in L^2(\Omega_L)$ exists. We denote $T_\epsilon \in [0,T]$ any time such that the smallness relation for the negative mass and energy of g and the boundedness of sequence $\{g_N\} := \{g\}$ in L^2 holds

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \frac{\int_{\{g<0\}} |g(v,t)|\langle v\rangle^2 \mathrm{d}v}{\int_{\{g\geq 0\}} g(v,t)\langle v\rangle^2 \mathrm{d}v} \leq \epsilon, \quad \sup_{N\in\mathbb{Z}^+}\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|g(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} < \infty. \tag{4.10}$$

for some fixed $\epsilon > 0$. Observe that the *conservation scheme* and this assumption implies that moments up to order 2 are controlled by the initial datum. Indeed, for $k = \{0,2\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_L} |g||v|^k = \int_{\Omega_L} g|v|^k - 2\int_{\Omega_L} g^-|v|^k &= \int_{\Omega_L} g_0|v|^k - 2\int_{\Omega_L} g^-|v|^k \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega_L} g_0|v|^k + 2\epsilon\int_{\Omega_L} g^+|v|^k \leq \int_{\Omega_L} g_0|v|^k + 2\epsilon\int_{\Omega_L}|g||v|^k.\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\epsilon \leq 1/4$ one obtains,

$$\int_{\Omega_L} |g(v,t)||v|^k \mathrm{d}v \leq 2\int_{\Omega_L} g_0|v|^k \mathrm{d}v, \quad \text{for } t\in[0,T_\epsilon], \quad k = 1,2. \tag{4.11}$$

Lemma 4.3. *For any lateral size $L > 0$ and moment $k > 0$ there exist an extension E and a number of modes $N_0(T_\epsilon, L, k)$ such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|g\|_{L^1_k(\Omega_L)} \leq C_k\big(\|g_0\|_{L^1_2},\, m_{k'}(g_0)\big), \quad \forall\, N \geq N_0\,,$$

with $C_k(\cdot)$ a constant depending only on k, $\|g_0\|_{L^1_2}$, and $m_{k'}(g_0)$ with $k' = \max\{k,k_0\}$. The number $k_0 > 0$ it is uniquely determined by $\|g_0\|_{L^1_2}$.

Proof. We fix $k > 0$ and $L > 0$ and keep in mind that g_0 has support in Ω_L, and thus, possesses moments of any order. Multiply equation (3.1) by $\mathrm{sgn}(g)|v|^{\lambda k}$ and integrate in Ω_L

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_{\Omega_L} |g(v)||v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v &= \int_{\Omega_L} Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)(v)|v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v + \int_{\Omega_L}\big(Q_c(g)(v) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)(v)\big)|v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega_L} Q^+(|\mathrm{E}g|,|\mathrm{E}g|)(v)|v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v \\ &\quad - \int_{\Omega_L} Q^-(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)(v)\mathrm{sgn}(\mathrm{E}g)(v)|v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v + L^{d/2}\|\left(Q_c(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\right)|v|^{\lambda k}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}.\end{aligned}$$

For the integral with the loss collision operator use $\mathrm{E}g = \big|\mathrm{E}g\big| - 2\big(\mathrm{E}g\big)^-$, properties 2 and 4 given in section 2.3 for the extension operator, and (4.11) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_L} Q^-(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)(v)\mathrm{sgn}(\mathrm{E}g)(v)|v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v &\geq \int_{\Omega_L} |\mathrm{E}g(v)||v|^{\lambda k}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\mathrm{E}g(v_*)||v-v_*|^\lambda \mathrm{d}v_*\mathrm{d}v \\ &\quad - C_0\,\delta^{2\lambda}\,\epsilon\,\|g_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}\big(m_{k+1}(g) + m_k(g)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Whence,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_{\Omega_L} |g(v)||v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v &\leq \int_{\Omega_L} Q(|\mathrm{E}g|,|\mathrm{E}g|)(v)|v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v \\ &\quad + L^{d/2}\|\left(Q_c(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\right)|v|^{\lambda k}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + C_0\,\delta^{2\lambda}\,\epsilon\,\|g_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}\big(m_{k+1}(g) + m_k(g)\big).\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

From the discussion in [18] or [6] and using the *conservative property of the scheme* we find that the first term is bounded by

$$\int_{\Omega_L} Q(|\mathrm{E}g|,|\mathrm{E}g|)(v)|v|^{\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v \leq S_k - \mu_k\, m_0(g_0)\, m_{k+1}, \quad \tfrac{2}{\lambda} < k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where S_k depends on the moments of g of order *less or equal* than k and $\mu_k \nearrow 1$ as $k \to \infty$ being a universal parameter given by

$$\mu_k = 1 - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \left(\tfrac{1+\hat{u}\cdot\sigma}{2}\right)^k b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma)\,\mathrm{d}\sigma.$$

We refer to [18, Lemma 3] for details and proof. We additionally used the properties of the extension operator in controlling the moments of the extension $\mathrm{E}g$ by the moments of the actual solution g. Choose

$$\epsilon \leq \frac{\mu_{\frac{\lambda}{2}}\, m_0(g_0)}{2\, C_0\, \delta^{2\lambda}\, \|g_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}} \tag{4.13}$$

in (4.12) to conclude that,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} m_k(g) \leq S_k - \frac{\mu_{\frac{\lambda}{2}}\, m_0(g_0)}{2}\, m_{k+1}(g) + L^{d/2} \| \left(Q_c(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\right)|v|^{\lambda k}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}. \tag{4.14}$$

To ease that notation define the constant $K(g_0) := \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\frac{\lambda}{2}} m_0(g_0)$ that may be regarded as a constant depending only on the mass of g_0. Using Theorem 3.3, one has for any $k' \geq 0$ that the last term is controlled by

$$\begin{aligned}\| \left(Q_c(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\right)|v|^{\lambda k}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq & \frac{C}{\sqrt{k+d}} L^{\lambda k} \|Q_u(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ & + \frac{\delta^{2\lambda k'}}{\sqrt{k+d}} O_{(d/2+\lambda(k'-k))}\big(m_{k'+1}(g)\; m_0(g_0) + Z_{k'}(g)\big),\end{aligned}$$

therefore, choosing $k' = k$ and introducing $\tilde{S}_k = Z_k + S_k$ containing all the lower moment dependence

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} m_k(g) \leq \tilde{S}_k - \left(K(g_0) - \frac{C\delta^{2\lambda(k+1)}}{\sqrt{k+d}}\right) m_{k+1}(g) + CL^{\lambda k + d/2} \|Q_u(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}. \tag{4.15}$$

Recall that we can choose the extension such that δ is as close as 1 as desired, in particular, we can choose it such that $\delta^{2\lambda(k+1)} \leq 2$. Note that for $k \geq k_0 := (4C/K(g_0))^2$ the term with $m_{k+1}(g)$ in the right side of (4.15) becomes an absorption term. Furthermore, recall that the sequence $\{g\} = \{g_N\}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{C}(0,T_\epsilon; L^2(\Omega_L))$, therefore, the method for proving item (2) in Proposition 4.1 holds. Thus, the last term in the right side of (4.15) can be made uniformly small in $[0,T_\epsilon]$ by increasing N. More specifically, there exists $N_0 := N_0(T_\epsilon, L, k)$ such that for any $N \geq N_0$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} m_k(g) &\leq \tilde{S}_k - \frac{K(g_0)}{2} m_{k+1}(g) + O(1) \\ &\leq 2^k\, C\, m_1(g_0)\, m_k(g) + O(1) - \tilde{K}(g_0)\, m_k(g)^{\frac{k+1}{k}}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

for possibly different constant $\tilde{K}(g_0)$ depending only on $\|g_0\|_{L^1_2}$. Note that we used the control on Z_k given by Theorem 8.2 in the appendix and estimate (4.11). Similar control is valid for S_k. Thus, Gronwall's lemma readily implies that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} m_k(g) \leq \max\left\{A_k\big(\|g_0\|_{L^1_2}\big), m_k(g_0)\right\}.$$

This proves the result for $k \geq k_0$. The case $0 < k < k_0$ follows by simple interpolation

$$m_k(g) \leq m_0(g)^{1-\frac{k}{k_0}} m_{k_0}(g)^{\frac{k}{k_0}} \leq \left(2\, m_0(g_0)\right)^{1-\frac{k}{k_0}} m_{k_0}(g)^{\frac{k}{k_0}}\,.$$

□

Observe that the *conservative scheme* implies that

$$\int_{\Omega_L} g(w,t)|v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w = \int_{\Omega_L} g_0(w)|v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w\,. \tag{4.17}$$

We now prove that (4.17) and condition (4.10) imply a uniform lower bound for the negative part of the collision operator.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume the uniform propagation of some moment* $\frac{2+\mu}{\lambda}$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \int_{\Omega_L} |g(w,t)||w|^{2+\mu} dw \leq C(g_0) < \infty\,, \quad \mu > 0.$$

Then,

$$\left(g * |u|^\lambda\right)(v) \geq C(g_0)\langle v\rangle^\lambda, \tag{4.18}$$

with $C(g_0) > 0$ *depending only on the mass, energy and the* $\frac{2+\mu}{\lambda}$*-moment of* g_0*.*

Proof. Notice that in the ball $B(0,r)$ one has for any $R > 0$ and $\mu > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{|v-w|\leq R} g(w,t)|v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(w,t)|v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w - \int_{|v-w|\geq R} g(w,t)|v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_0(w)|v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w - \int_{|v-w|\geq R} g(w,t)|v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w \\
&\geq C_0(g_0)\,\langle v\rangle^2 - \frac{1}{R^\mu}\int_{|v-w|\geq R} |g(w,t)||v-w|^{2+\mu} \mathrm{d}w\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

For the last inequality we expanded the square in the integral of the right side and assumed with no loss of generality that the momentum of g_0 is zero. We use in the right side integral of (4.19) the inequality $|v-w| \leq \langle v\rangle\langle w\rangle$ and the uniform propagation of the $\frac{2+\mu}{\lambda}$-moment to obtain

$$\int_{|v-w|\leq R} g(w,t)|v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w \geq C_0(g_0)\langle v\rangle^2 - \frac{C_1}{R^\mu}\langle v\rangle^{2+\mu} \geq \frac{C_0(g_0)}{2}\,, \quad \forall\, v \in B(0,r)\,,$$

provided $R := R(C_1, r)$ is sufficiently large and with C_1 a constant depending on $\sup_{t\geq 0} m_{(2+\mu)/\lambda}(g)$. Therefore, using the control (4.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(w,t)|v-w|^\lambda \mathrm{d}w &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g(w,t)||v-w|^\lambda \mathrm{d}w - 2\int_{\{g<0\}} |g(w,t)||v-w|^\lambda \mathrm{d}w \\
&\geq (1-2\epsilon)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g(w,t)||v-w|^\lambda \mathrm{d}w \geq (1-2\epsilon)\int_{|v-w|\leq R} |g(w,t)||v-w|^\lambda \mathrm{d}w \\
&\geq \frac{1-2\epsilon}{R^{2-\lambda}}\int_{|v-w|\leq R} |g(w,t)||v-w|^2 \mathrm{d}w \geq \frac{1-2\epsilon}{2R^{2-\lambda}}\, C_0(g_0)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

valid for any $v \in B(0,r)$ and provided $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. Moreover, for any $\lambda \in (0,1]$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(w,t)|v-w|^\lambda \mathrm{d}w &\geq (1-2\epsilon)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g(w,t)||v-w|^\lambda \mathrm{d}w \\ &\geq (1-2\epsilon)\big(m_0(g_0)|v|^\lambda - 2\,\|g_0\|_{L^1_2}\big),\end{aligned}$$

as a consequence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(w,t)|v-w|^\lambda \mathrm{d}w \geq (1-2\epsilon)\left(\frac{C_0(g_0)}{2R^{2-\lambda}}\,\mathbf{1}_{B(0,r)} + \big(m_0(g_0)|v|^\lambda - 2\,\|g_0\|_{L^1_2}\big)\,\mathbf{1}_{B(0,r)^c}\right). \tag{4.20}$$

Inequality (4.18) follows from (4.20) choosing r sufficiently large and then $R(C_1, r)$. □

4.3 Uniform L^2_k integrability propagation

The lower bound on the collision operator given in Lemma 4.4 will allow us to control the L^2_k-norms of g uniformly with respect to the asymptotic parameters L and N. Indeed, fix $k > 0$, a lateral size $L > 0$, and observe that

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) + \big(Q_c(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g)\big).$$

Thus, multiplying this equation by $g\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}$ and integrating on Ω_L on has

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|g\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} = \int_{\Omega_L}\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k} g\, Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\mathrm{d}v + \int_{\Omega_L}\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k} g\,\big(Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_c(g)\big)\mathrm{d}v =: I_1 + I_2.$$

Using smoothing properties of the gain collision operator, see Theorem 8.7 in the appendix or refer to [66], [5], and the lower bound control (4.18) it follows that

$$I_1 \leq C_1\|g\|^{1+1/d}_{L^2_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} - \frac{C(g_0)}{2}\|g\|^2_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

with constant C_1 depending at most on the k–moment of g. Also, note that we used the properties of the extension operator in order find a control in terms of the norms of g. Meanwhile, employing Theorem 3.3

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq L^{\lambda k}\|g\|_{L^2_k(\mathbb{R}^d)}\,\|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_c(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ &\leq CL^{\lambda k}\|g\|_{L^2_k(\mathbb{R}^d)}\Big(\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]}\|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d/2+\lambda k'}\big(m_{k'+1}(g)\,m_0(g) + Z_{k'}(g)\big)\Big), \end{aligned}$$

valid for any $k' \geq 0$. Therefore, fixing $k' = k$ one concludes that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq O(1) + C_1\|g\|^{1/d}_{L^2_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} - \frac{C(g_0)}{2}\|g\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

provided we use a sufficiently large number of modes $N_0(T_\epsilon, L, k)$ such that

$$L^{\lambda k}\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]}\|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \sim O(1), \quad N \geq N_0(T_\epsilon, L, k).$$

Note that the dependence of the constants it at most on the k–moment of g which by lemma 4.3 is controlled by the k–moment of g_0. This readily implies by Gronwall's lemma that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]}\|g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq \max\big\{\|g_0\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}, C_2\big\}, \tag{4.21}$$

with C_2 given by the root of the function $O(1) + C_1\, x^{1/d} - \frac{C_0(g_0)}{2}\, x$. Let us write down this result in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *For any lateral size $L > 0$ and moment $k > 0$ there exist an extension E and a number of modes $N_0(T_\epsilon, L, k)$ such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq \max\left\{\|g_0\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)},\, C_k\big(m_k(g_0)\big)\right\}, \quad N \geq N_0.$$

Moreover, the negative mass of g can be estimated as

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq e^{C\left(\|g_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}\right)T_\epsilon}\left(\|g_0^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d/2+\lambda k}\,\tilde{C}_k\big(m_{k+1}(g_0)\big)\,\max\left\{1, T_\epsilon\right\}\right),\ N \geq N_0.$$

The constants C_k and $\tilde{C}_k$ are independent of the asymptotic parameters T_ϵ ,L and N.

Proof. It remains to estimate the negative mass of g. This can be done accurately due to propagation of moments given by lemma 4.3. Let us start with the equality (assume that E is the extension by zero for simplicity with the understanding that the generalization to other extensions can readily be achieved)

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = Q_c(g) - Q_u(g) + Q_u(g) - Q(g,g) + Q(g,g) = I_1 + Q(g,g)\,,$$

with $I_1 := Q_c(g) - Q_u(g) + Q_u(g) - Q(g,g)$. Multiplying this equation by $g^- = 1_{\{g\leq 0\}}g$ and integrating in Ω_L to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|g^-\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_{\Omega_L} I_1\, g\, \mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}\,\mathrm{d}v + \int_{\Omega_L} Q(g,g)\, g\, \mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}\,\mathrm{d}v\,. \tag{4.22}$$

Recall from the proof of item *(3)* of lemma 4.1

$$\begin{aligned} Q^+(g,g)\, g\, \mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}} &= \big(Q^+(g^+,g^+) + Q^+(g^+,g^-) + Q^+(g^-,g^+) + Q^+(g^-,g^-)\big)\, g\, \mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}} \\ &\leq \big(Q^+(g^+,g^-) + Q^+(g^-,g^+)\big)\, g\, \mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using Young's inequality [3], [2], [66] it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_L} Q^+(g,g)\, g\, \mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}\,\mathrm{d}v &\leq \int_{\Omega_L} \big(Q^+(g^+,g^-) + Q^+(g^-,g^+)\big)\, g\, \mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}\,\mathrm{d}v \\ &\leq C\,\|b\|_\infty \|g^+\|_{L^1_1(\Omega_L)}\|g^-\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq C\big(\|g_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}\big)\,\|g^-\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

where we have assumed that the angular kernel b is bounded to use a bilinear estimate. Recall, additionally, that Lemma 4.4 implies

$$\int_{\Omega_L} Q^-(g,g)\, g\, \mathbf{1}_{\{g\leq 0\}}\,\mathrm{d}v \geq C(g_0)\|g^-\|^2_{L^2_{1/2}(\Omega_L)} \geq 0. \tag{4.24}$$

As a consequence of Theorem 3.3, Lemma 4.3 and inequality (4.22) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &\leq C\big(\|g_0\|_{L^1(\Omega_L)}\big)\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ &\quad + C\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|Q(Eg,Eg) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d/2+\lambda k}\, C_k\big(m_{k+1}(g)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

Recall that the $(k+1)$-moments of g are controlled by $(k+1)$-moments of g_0 thanks to lemma 4.3 provided the number of modes satisfies $N \geq N_0(T_\epsilon, L, k)$. Furthermore, taking N_0 large enough to additionally satisfy

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|Q(Eg,Eg) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}(s)ds \leq O_{d/2+\lambda k} C_k, \quad N \geq N_0,$$

the result follows applying Gronwall's lemma in (4.25). □

4.4 Uniform H_k Sobolev regularity propagation

Let us generalize Lemma 4.5 for the derivatives of g. We change assumption (4.10) to the more restrictive

$$\sup_{N\in\mathbb{Z}^+} \sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|g(t)\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)} < \infty. \tag{4.26}$$

We also fix and extension operator $E : H^{\alpha_0}(\Omega_L) \to H^{\alpha_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and assume that $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0]$. Thanks to (4.26) and using similar arguments to those given in the proof of item (2) in Lemma 4.1, it is possible to prove that the sequence $\{g_N\}$ is Cauchy in $\mathcal{C}\big(0,T; H^\alpha(\Omega_L)\big)$. Then

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)} \to 0 \text{ as } N \to \infty. \tag{4.27}$$

Fix $k \geq 0$ and use an induction argument on the derivative order $|\alpha|$. The initial step of the induction follows thanks to Lemma 4.5. For the case $|\alpha| > 0$, we differentiate in velocity equation (3.1) and write

$$\frac{\partial(\partial^\alpha g)}{\partial t} = \partial^\alpha Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) + \partial^\alpha\big(Q_c(g) - Q_u(g)\big) + \partial^\alpha\big(Q_u(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\big).$$

Multiply by $\partial^\alpha g\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}$ and integrate in the velocity domain Ω_L to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\partial^\alpha g\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq \int_{\Omega_L} \partial^\alpha Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\partial^\alpha g\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k} + \|\partial^\alpha g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\|\partial^\alpha\big(Q_c(g) - Q_u(g)\big)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} +$$
$$\|\partial^\alpha g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\|\partial^\alpha\big(Q_u(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\big)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \tag{4.28}$$

Recall from Lemma 3.1 that the term $Q_c(g) - Q_u(g)$ is a second order polynomial, therefore its derivatives are at most a second order polynomial, thus Theorem 3.3 implies

$$I_2 \leq L^{\lambda k}\|\partial^\alpha g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\Big(\|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d/2+\lambda k'}\big(m_{k'+1}(g)m_0(g) + Z_{k'}\big)\Big) \tag{4.29}$$

for any $k' \geq 0$. Additionally, the term I_3 is controlled by

$$I_3 \leq L^{\lambda k}\|\partial^\alpha g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)}. \tag{4.30}$$

Let us state the result of this section before estimating the term I_1.

Lemma 4.6. *Assume $g_0 \in H^\alpha_{k+2}(\Omega_L)$ with $\alpha \in [0,\alpha_0]$ and $k \geq 0$. For any lateral size $L > 0$ there exist an extension E_{α_0} and a number of modes $N_0(T_\epsilon, L, k, \alpha)$ such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_\epsilon]} \|g\|_{H^\alpha_k(\Omega_L)} \leq \max\big\{\|g_0\|_{H^\alpha_{k+2}(\Omega_L)}, C_k\big(m_k(g_0)\big)\big\}, \quad N \geq N_0,$$

where $C_k(\cdot)$ depends on k and the k–moment of g_0.

Proof. Let us finish the induction argument, thus, assume that Lemma 4.6 is valid for $|\alpha| - 1$. The term I_1 defined above in (4.28) can be controlled implementing a technique introduced in [24] and used for the control of H_k-norms in [66, Theorem 3.5]

$$I_1 \leq C_1 \left\|\partial^\alpha g\right\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} - C(g_0) \left\|\partial^\alpha g\right\|^2_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\Omega_L)}, \tag{4.31}$$

where C_1 depends on the $L^2_{k+2}(\Omega_L)$ norm of the lower order derivatives, which are bounded independent of T_ϵ, L and N by the induction hypothesis, and $C(g_0)$ is the constant given in (4.18). The properties of the extension operator E have been used to find a control in term of the norms of g. Thus, choosing $k' = k$ in (4.29), we obtain form inequalities (4.28), (4.29), (4.30) and (4.31)

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\partial^\alpha g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq C_1 - \frac{C_0}{2}\left\|\partial^\alpha g\right\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\Omega_L)} + CL^k \left\|Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\right\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)}.$$

Conclude using Gronwall's lemma together with (4.27). □

Remark 4.7. Note that the initial restriction $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_0]$ is due to the fact that in general $Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g)$ possesses at most α_0 derivatives.

5 Error estimates and asymptotic behavior

The proof of Theorem 1.1 consists in a detailed and rigorous study of global existence of approximating solution to the space homogeneous solutions to the Boltzmann equation for binary interactions by the proposed spectral-Lagrangian constrained minimization scheme presented in the previous Sections, as well as detailed error estimates as well as long time convergence of the numerical solution to the Maxwellian equilibrium state, uniquely determined by the initial state.

More specifically, we study the global existence and error estimates for the spectral scheme in the case of smooth and non-smooth initial data with at least initial density mass and and kinetic energy bounded as well their long time behavior.

In order to discuss the existence of consistent discrete solutions, the first result address the removal the small negative mass and energy assumption (4.10) used throughout the previous section.

We assume in the sequel that $f_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is nonnegative and that there exists $N_0(L, f_0)$ such that

$$\|(\Pi^N f_0)^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \sim \tilde{C}_{1+2/\lambda}\, O_{d/2+\lambda+2}, \quad N \geq N_0, \tag{5.1}$$

where $\tilde{C}_{1+2/\lambda}$ is given in Lemma 4.5. Condition (5.1) is alway met as long as our work domain Ω_L is sufficiently large to accurately approximate the initial configuration f_0. In all cases for simulations the initial state f_0 is assumed compactly supported, thus, a natural choice to satisfy (5.1) is $\mathrm{supp}(f_0) \subset \Omega_L$, where the choice of the cut-off domain Ω_L was discussed in Section 2.2.

Indeed, the following result addresses Theorem 1.1, part 1.

5.1 Global existence of the scheme

Theorem 5.1. *Set $g_{oN} = \Pi^N f_0 \in L^1_2 \cap L^2(\Omega_L)$. For any time $T > 0$ there exist a lateral size $L(T, f_0)$ and a number of modes $N_0(T, L, f_0)$ where the Problem (3.1) has a well defined solution $g \in \mathcal{C}\big(0, T; L^2(\Omega_L)\big)$ for any $N \geq N_0$ with estimates*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} < \infty, \qquad \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq 2\,\tilde{C}_{1+2/\lambda}\, e^{C\|f_0\|_{L^1_2} T} O_{d/2+\lambda+2}. \tag{5.2}$$

Furthermore, the sequence $\{g_N\}$ formed with initial condition g_{oN} converges strongly in $\mathcal{C}(0, T; L^2(\Omega_L))$ to $\bar{g}$, the solution of Problem (4.2).

Proof. In order to use the lemmas of previous section we need to control the negative mass and energy of g such that (4.10) is satisfied in $[0, T]$. Note that such lemmas are valid for the choice

$$\epsilon_o = \min\left\{\tfrac{1}{4}, \frac{\mu_{\frac{\lambda}{2}}\, m_0(f_0)}{4C_0\,\|f_0\|_{L^1_{2(\Omega_L)}}}\right\}. \tag{5.3}$$

Thus, fix $T > 0$ and choose $L > 0$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{L^\lambda} \leq \frac{2\epsilon_o}{(1+\epsilon_o)} \frac{\|f_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}}{C(T, f_0)} \\ &\quad \text{where} \quad \frac{C(T, f_0)}{2} := 2\tilde{C}_{1+2/\lambda}\, e^{C\|f_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)} T} + \max\big\{\|f_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)},\, C_0\big(\|f_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}\big)\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

The constants defining $C(T, f_0)$ are given in Lemma 4.5 which are independent of L and N. Divide the time interval $[0, T]$ in subintervals I_i of diameter $\Delta T = O_{d+2(\lambda+1)}$ and set $T_i := i\Delta T$. In the interval I_1, condition (4.10) is satisfied thanks to item (3) of Proposition 4.1, the fact that mass and energy are conserved with the scheme, the definition of L and provided $N \geq N_1(L, f_0)$ for some N_1 sufficiently large so that g^-_{oN} satisfies (5.1).

Assume that Theorem 5.1 holds in $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i} \mathrm{I}_j$, that is, the approximation solution g is well defined in $[0, T_i]$ and (5.2) holds for $T = T_i$ provided $N \geq N_i(T_i, L, f_0)$. Therefore,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_i]} \|g^-_N\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)} \leq L^{d/2+2} \sup_{t\in[0,T_i]} \|g^-_N\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq 2\tilde{C}_{1+\lambda^{-1}2}\, e^{C\|f_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)} T}\, O_\lambda. \tag{5.5}$$

Conservation of mass and energy, estimate (5.5) and the definition of L in (5.4) implies that assumption (4.10) holds in $[0, T_i]$. Thus, Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.5 guarantee the uniform propagation of moments and the L^2-norm for g in the interval $[0, T_i]$. Hence, we additionally have the uniform estimate

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_i]} \|g\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq \max\big\{\|f_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}, C_0\big(\|f_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}\big)\big\}, \quad N \geq N_i\,. \tag{5.6}$$

Using Proposition 4.1 in the interval I_{i+1} with initial condition $g_0(v) = g(T_i, v)$ and estimates (5.2) and (5.6), one concludes that g is well defined in such interval with negative mass estimated by

$$\sup_{t\in[T_i,T_{i+1}]} \|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} = \|g^-(T_i, v)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + O_{d/2+\lambda+2}\|g(T_i, v)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq \frac{C(T, f_0)}{2}\, O_{d/2+\lambda+2}\,. \tag{5.7}$$

Estimate (5.7) and the choice of L implies that assumption (4.10) holds in the interval I_{i+1}, and thus, in the interval $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i+1}\mathrm{I}_j$. Then, we can bootstrap using the estimate for the negative mass given in Lemma 4.5

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,T_{i+1}]}\|g^-\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} &\le e^{C\|f_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}T}\left(\|g^-_{oN}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}+O_{d/2+\lambda+2}\tilde{C}_{1+2/\lambda}\right)\\ &\le 2\tilde{C}_{1+2/\lambda}\,e^{C\|f_0\|_{L^1_2(\Omega_L)}T}O_{d/2+\lambda+2},\quad N\ge N_{i+1}(T_{i+1},L,f_0)\end{aligned}\tag{5.8}$$

where N_{i+1} has been chosen to satisfy also

$$\|g^-_{oN}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)}\le\tilde{C}_{1+2/\lambda}\,O_{d/2+\lambda+2},\quad\text{for}\quad N\ge N_{i+1}.$$

This concludes the proof of the induction argument. Finally, the convergence of $\{g_N\}$ to $\bar{g}$ is direct given the estimate (5.2) for the L^2-norm and the arguments given in Proposition 4.1. □

Thus the proof of statement Theorem 1.1, part 1, is completed.

5.2 Error estimates of the scheme

Proposition 5.1 allows us to give quantitative error estimates for the approximation sequence in any simulation time $T>0$ provided we choose appropriate lateral size $L(T,f_0)\ge 0$ and number of modes $N\ge N_0(T,L,f_0)$. Indeed, this proposition extends all results of Section 4 to any time interval $[0,T]$ because the negative mass and energy of g is controlled in the way described there. Observe that subtracting the Boltzmann equation (2.1) and its conserved projection approximation (3.1) in Ω_L one obtains

$$\frac{\partial(f-g)}{\partial t}=Q(f,f)-Q_c(g)=\big(Q(f,f)-Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\big)+\big(Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)-Q_c(g)\big).$$

Multiplying this equation by $(f-g)\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}$ and integrating in Ω_L

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|f-g\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}&=\int_{\Omega_L}\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}(f-g)\big(Q(f,f)-Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\big)\mathrm{d}v\\ &\quad+\int_{\Omega_L}\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}(f-g)\big(Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)-Q_c(g)\big)\mathrm{d}v=:I_1+I_2.\end{aligned}$$

The term I_1 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}I_1=&\int_{\Omega_L}\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}(f-g)\big(Q^+(f+\mathrm{E}g,f-\mathrm{E}g)+Q^+(f-\mathrm{E}g,f+\mathrm{E}g)\big)\mathrm{d}v\\ &-\int_{\Omega_L}\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}(f-g)\,Q^-(f+\mathrm{E}g,f-\mathrm{E}g)\mathrm{d}v-\int_{\Omega_L}\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}(f-g)\,Q^-(f-\mathrm{E}g,f+\mathrm{E}g)\mathrm{d}v\,.\end{aligned}$$

Solutions f and g uniformly propagate high order moments thanks to Lemma 4.3, therefore the last term has the lower bound

$$\int_{\Omega_L}\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}(f-g)Q^-(f-\mathrm{E}g,f+\mathrm{E}g)\mathrm{d}v\ge C_0\|f-g\|^2_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\Omega_L)}\,.\tag{5.9}$$

In the estimate (5.9) we recalled that $\mathrm{E}g = g$ a.e. in Ω_L. The second integral can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_L} \langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}(f-g)Q^-(f+\mathrm{E}g, f-\mathrm{E}g)\mathrm{d}v \leq \|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\|f+g\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|f-\mathrm{E}g\|_{L^1_1(\mathbb{R}^d)}\\ \leq C_1\|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\left(\|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} + \|f\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega_L)} + \|g\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\Omega_L\setminus\delta^{-1}\Omega_L)}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

for any $k > 1 + \frac{d}{2\lambda}$. The constant C_1 depends on the $L^2_{k+1/2}$ norms of f and g which are uniformly bounded in $[0,T]$ for $N \geq N_0(T, L, f_0)$. Using a bilinear version of [66, Theorem 3.3] (valid for b bounded, refer also to Theorem 8.7 in the Appendix) gives the control for the first term

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Omega_L} \langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}(f-g)\left(Q^+(f+\mathrm{E}g, f-\mathrm{E}g) + Q^+(f-\mathrm{E}g, f+\mathrm{E}g)\right)\mathrm{d}v \leq \|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\times\\ \left(C_2(\mu)\|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} + \mu\|f-g\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\Omega_L)} + \|f\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega_L)} + \|g\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\Omega_L\setminus\delta^{-1}\Omega_L)}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

valid for any $\mu > 0$ and $C_2(\mu)$ depending only on the mass and energy of f and g. Set $\mu = C_0/2$ and combine (5.9), (5.10) and (5.11) to obtain

$$I_1 \leq C_3\|f-g\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} + C_4\|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\left(\|f\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega_L)} + \|g\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\Omega_L\setminus\delta^{-1}\Omega_L)}\right),$$

with C_3 and C_4 independent of the simulation time T, lateral size L and number of modes N. Furthermore, using Theorem 3.3 we have for any $k' \geq 0$

$$\|Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) - Q_c(g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq C_5\, L^{\lambda k}\left(\|Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + \delta^{2k'}O_{d/2+\lambda(k'-1)}\|g\|_{L^1_{k'}(\Omega_L)}\right).$$

Therefore, using Hölder's inequality

$$I_2 \leq C_5\, L^{\lambda k}\|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\left(\|Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + \delta^{2k'}O_{d/2+\lambda(k'-1)}\|g\|_{L^1_{k'}(\Omega_L)}\right).$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} X &:= \|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}, \quad h := C_5\, L^{\lambda k}\|Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)},\\ o &:= C_4\left(\|f\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega_L)} + \|g\|_{L^2_{k+1/2}(\Omega_L\setminus\delta^{-1}\Omega_L)}\right) + C_5\delta^{2k'}O_{d/2+\lambda(k'-k-1)}\|g\|_{L^1_{k'}(\Omega_L)}\\ &= \delta^{2k'}O_{\lambda(k'-k-1/2)}\left(\|f\|_{L^2_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|g\|_{L^2_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|g\|_{L^1_{k'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, using the estimates on I_1 and I_2

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}X \leq CX + h + o.$$

Thus, Gronwall's lemma implies

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|f-g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq \left(\|f_0 - g_{oN}\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} + \int_0^T h(s)\mathrm{d}s + \sup_{t\in[0,T]} o(t)\right)e^{CT}, \tag{5.12}$$

for any $T > 0$, lateral size $L(T, f_0)$ and $N \geq N_0(T, L, f_0)$ where the latter two are given in Proposition 5.1. This estimate is enough to prove estimate (1.2) of Theorem 1.1, part 2, as it is shown in the next statement.

Theorem 5.2 (L^2_k-error estimate)**.** *Fix k', $k \geq 0$ and let $f_0 \in \big(L^1 \cap L^2\big)_{k'+k+1/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be an initial nonnegative configuration and f be the solution of the Boltzmann equation* (2.1)*. For any $T > 0$ there exists an extension E, a lateral size $L(T, f_0)$ and a number of modes $N_0(T, L, f_0, k)$ such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f - g\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq C_{k'} e^{C_k T}\, O_{\lambda k'}, \quad N \geq N_0\,.$$

The constants depend as $C_k := C_k\big(\|f_0\|_{L^2_q}\big)$ with $q = \max\{k + \frac{1}{2}, 1 + \frac{d}{2\lambda}\}$ and $C_{k'} := \big(\|f_0\|_{L^{1,2}_{k'+k+1/2}}\big)$. In particular, the strong limit of the sequence $\{g_N\}$ in $\mathcal{C}(0, T; L^2_k(\Omega_L))$ (i.e. $\bar{g}$) satisfies the same estimate.

Proof. Rename $k' - k - 1/2 \to k'$ in estimate (5.12). It suffices to choose $N_0(T, L, f_0, k)$ large enough and such that

$$\|f_0 - g_{oN}\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} + \int_0^T h(s)\mathrm{d}s \sim O_{\lambda k'}\,, \quad N \geq N_0\,,$$

because Lemmas 4.3 and 4.5 already imply that $\sup_{t\in[0,T]} o(t) = \delta^{2k'} O_{\lambda k'}$ under the integrability condition assumed for f_0. Furthermore, we can choose δ arbitrarily close to 1 with a suitable extension E, for instance, such that $\delta^{2k'} \leq 2$. Estimate (5.12) implies the result. □

In order to prove Theorem 1.1 part 3, the need to show the improvement in the rate of convergence with respect to the number of modes N of the approximating solutions towards the Boltzmann solution provided that the initial configuration is smooth and has at least initial mass and energy bounded. The result is a consequence of the method of proof of Theorem 5.2. Recall that the extension operator E has range in the set of functions of at most $|\alpha_0|$ (weak) derivatives.

Theorem 5.3 (H^α-error estimates)**.** *Fix $k' \geq 2$ and $k \geq 0$, $\alpha_0 > 0$ and let $f_0 \in L^1_2 \cap H^{\alpha_0}_q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (with $q = \max\{k+k', 1+\frac{d}{2\lambda}\}$) be a nonnegative configuration and f be the solution of the Boltzmann equation* (2.1)*. For $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$ there exists an extension E_{α_0}, a lateral size $L(T, f_0)$ and a number of modes $N_0(T, L, f_0, k, \alpha)$ such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f - g\|_{H^\alpha_k(\Omega_L)} \leq C_{k'} e^{C_k T} \left(O\left(\frac{L^{\lambda k + |\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0|-|\alpha|}} \right) + O_{\lambda k'} \right), \quad N \geq N_0, \tag{5.13}$$

where the constants C_k and $C_{k'}$ depend on the $H^{\alpha_0}_q$-norms and moments of f_0.

Remark 5.4. The error term $O_{\lambda k'}$ appearing in the estimate of Theorem 5.3 represents the uniform error generated from the velocity truncation as Theorem 5.2 predicts. In fact choosing any $k' \geq 2$, and $\mu > 0$, there exist an L_* depending only on the mass ρ_0 and temperature T_0 of the initial state f_0, such that for any $L \geq \text{Ł}_*$ the following global estimate

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f - g\|_{H^\alpha_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C_{k'} e^{c_k T} \left(\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{L^{\lambda k + |\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0|-|\alpha|}} \right) + \mathrm{O}\big(L^{-\lambda k'}\big) \right) + \mu, \quad \text{for any } N \geq N_0, \tag{5.14}$$

with μ the small error constant defined in Section 2.2 equation (2.20), depending on the mass ρ_0 and temperature T_0 of the initial state f_0. This μ parameter determines the minimal length L_* of a cut-off domain Ω_L for the numerical error being measured globally in R^d (see section 2.2).

Proof. The proof is by induction on the order of the multi-index α. The case $|\alpha| = 0$ follows from estimate (5.12) and Lemma 8.1 in the appendix. Indeed, in this case

$$h(t) = C_5\, L^{\lambda k}\|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le C_6\, L^{\lambda k}\left(\frac{L}{N}\right)^{|\alpha_0|}\|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\|_{H^{\alpha_0}(\Omega_L)}$$
$$\le C_7\, L^{\lambda k}\left(\frac{L}{N}\right)^{|\alpha_0|}\|g\|^2_{H^{\alpha_0}_{\mu}(\Omega_L)},$$

for any $\mu > 1 + \frac{d}{2\lambda}$. Additionally, using Lemma 8.1

$$\|f_0 - g_{oN}\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \le L^{\lambda k}\|f_0 - g_{oN}\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \le C\, L^{\lambda k}\left(\frac{L}{N}\right)^{|\alpha_0|}\|f_0\|^2_{H^{\alpha_0}(\Omega_L)}.$$

Assume the result valid for any multi-index $\nu < \alpha \le \alpha_0$. Then after the usual steps,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|\partial^\alpha(f-g)\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \le I_1 + I_2 + I_3\,.$$

Using Leibniz formula and the smoothing effect of the positive collision operator with the terms having the highest order derivatives one concludes that I_1 is controlled as

$$I_1 := \int_{\Omega_L}\partial^\alpha\big(Q(f,f) - Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g)\big)\,\partial^\alpha(f-g)\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v$$
$$\le C_1\,\|\partial^\alpha(f-g)\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \;+\; \text{lower order terms}\,.$$

A typical lower order term is given by $(0 < \nu < \alpha)$

$$\|\partial^\alpha(f-g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\|\partial^{\alpha-\nu}(f+\mathrm{E}g)\|_{L^2_{k+\mu}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\partial^\nu(f-g)\|_{L^2_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Lemma 4.6 implies that $\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|\partial^{\alpha-\nu}(f+\mathrm{E}g)\|_{L^2_{k+\mu}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C$, furthermore, using induction hypothesis,

$$\|\partial^\nu(f-g)\|_{L^2_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le \|\partial^\nu(f-g)\|_{L^2_{k+1}(\Omega_L)} + \|\partial^\nu f\|_{L^2_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega_L)} + \|\partial^\nu \mathrm{E}g\|_{L^2_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\Omega_L)}$$
$$\le C_{k'}e^{C_kT}\left(\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{L^{\lambda(k+1)+|\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0|-|\nu|}}\right) + \delta^{2(k+k')}\mathrm{O}_{\lambda k'}\right)$$
$$\le C_{k'}e^{C_kT}\left(\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{L^{\lambda k+|\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0|-|\alpha|}}\right) + \delta^{2(k+k')}\mathrm{O}_{\lambda k'}\right), \quad N \ge L^\lambda.$$

As a consequence one concludes that

$$I_1 \le C_1\,\|\partial^\alpha(f-g)\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}$$
$$+\|\partial^\alpha(f-g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}C_{k'}e^{C_kT}\left(\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{L^{\lambda k+|\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0|-|\alpha|}}\right) + \delta^{2(k+k')}\mathrm{O}_{\lambda k'}\right), \quad N \ge L^\lambda. \tag{5.15}$$

Regarding the term I_2,

$$I_2 := \int_{\Omega_L}\partial^\alpha\big(Q_c(g) - Q_u(g)\big)\,\partial^\alpha(f-g)\langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k}\mathrm{d}v \le \|\partial^\alpha(f-g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\|\partial^\alpha\big(Q_c(g) - Q_u(g)\big)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}.$$

Recall that $Q_c(g) - Q_u(g)$ is a quadratic polynomial, therefore, its H^α-norm is controlled by its L^2-norm for large L. Thus, using Theorem 3.3 one has for any $k'' \ge 0$

$$I_2 \le \|\partial^\alpha(f-g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)}\left(L^{\lambda k}\|Q(\mathrm{E}g,\mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} + \delta^{2k''}O_{d/2+\lambda(k''-k)}\right). \tag{5.16}$$

Finally the term I_3 satisfies

$$I_3 := \int_{\Omega_L} \partial^\alpha \big(Q_u(g) - Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g)\big)\, \partial^\alpha (f-g) \langle v\rangle^{2\lambda k} \mathrm{d}v$$
$$\leq L^k \|\partial^\alpha (f-g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \|\partial^\alpha \big(Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\big)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \tag{5.17}$$

Choosing $k'' = k' + k - 1$ one concludes after adding (5.15),(5.16) and (5.17)

$$I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \leq C_1 \|\partial^\alpha (f-g)\|^2_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} +$$
$$\|\partial^\alpha (f-g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} C_{k'} e^{C_k T} \left(L^{\lambda k} \|Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)} + \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{L^{\lambda k + |\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0| - |\alpha|}} \right) + \delta^{2(k+k')} \mathrm{O}_{\lambda k'} \right),$$

valid for any $N \geq \max\{N_0, L^\lambda\}$, where N_0 is the number of modes taken from Lemma 4.6. Using Lemma 8.1 in the appendix,

$$\|\partial^\alpha \big(Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g) - Q_u(g)\big)\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \left(\frac{L}{2\pi N} \right)^{|\alpha_0| - |\alpha|} \|\partial^\alpha Q(\mathrm{E}g, \mathrm{E}g)\|_{H^{\alpha_0 - \alpha}(\Omega_L)}$$
$$\leq C \left(\frac{L}{N} \right)^{|\alpha_0| - |\alpha|} \|g\|^2_{H^{\alpha_0}_{d/2+\lambda}(\Omega_L)}.$$

Whence,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \|\partial^\alpha (f-g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} \leq C_1 \, \|\partial^\alpha (f-g)\|_{L^2_k(\Omega_L)} + C_{k'} e^{C_k T} \left(\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{L^{\lambda k + |\alpha_0|}}{N^{|\alpha_0| - |\alpha|}} \right) + \delta^{2(k+k')} \mathrm{O}_{\lambda k'} \right),$$

and the conclusion follows from Gronwall's lemma. □

Note that, in particular, estimate (1.2) in Theorem 1.1 part 3, holds. Furthermore, as a corollary, the decay to the Maxwellian equilibrium estimate (1.4) in Theorem 1.1 part 4 follows.

Theorem 5.5 (Convergence to the equilibrium Maxwellian Statistical Equilibrium State)**.** *Fix $\alpha_0 \geq 0$ and let $f_0 \in H^{\alpha_0}_{1+\frac{d}{2\lambda}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a nonnegative configuration. Then, for every $\delta > 0$ there exist a simulation time $T := T(\delta) > 0$, an extension E_{α_0}, a lateral size $L(T, f_0)$ and a number of modes $N_0(T, L, f_0, \alpha_0)$ such that for any $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$*

$$\sup_{t \in [\frac{T}{2}, T]} \|\mathcal{M}_0 - g\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)} \leq \delta\,, \quad N \geq N_0\,,$$

where $\mathcal{M}_0$ is the Maxwellian having the same mass, momentum and energy of the initial configuration f_0.

Proof. Using the classical asymptotic Boltzmann theory [33] for variable hard potentials

$$\|\mathcal{M}_0 - f\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|\mathcal{M}_0 - f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \mathcal{G}^t\,,$$

where $\mathcal{G}^t$ was shown to be a decreasing function in time t, decaying faster than any polynomial, depending on some moments of f_0 [33] and even exponentially [64]. The first inequality above can be proved with the standard energy methods used for the Boltzmann equation. Thus, for every $\delta > 0$ there exists $T(\delta) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \geq \frac{T(\delta)}{2}} \|\mathcal{M}_0 - f\|_{H^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \delta/2\,. \tag{5.18}$$

Moreover, using Theorem 5.2 for the case $\alpha_0 = 0$ or Theorem 5.3 for the case $\alpha_0 > 0$ with $T = T(\delta)$ one concludes that there exist a lateral size $L(T, f_0)$ and number of modes $N_0(T, L, f_0, \alpha_0)$ such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|f - g\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)} \leq \delta/2\,, \quad N \geq N_0\,. \tag{5.19}$$

The result follows using triangle inequality with (5.18) and (5.19). □

The proof of the Theorem 1.1 is now completed.

Remark 5.6. Note that the relaxation of the Boltzmann solution is exponentially fast for variable hard potentials, therefore, simulation times are relatively small. This makes conservative schemes very stable even when using relatively small working domains and number of modes.

6 Conclusion

We have studied the global existence and error estimates for the homogeneous Boltzmann spectral method imposing conservation of mass, momentum and energy by Lagrange constrained optimization. The methods, estimates and numerical examples presented in the document show that imposing conservation of these quantities stabilizes the long time behavior of the discrete problem because such problem enjoys the same natural *a priori* estimates enjoyed by the true Boltzmann solution. In particular, the simulation time, the work domain and the number of modes can be chosen such that the discrete solution approximates with any desired accuracy the stationary state of the original Boltzmann problem in the long run. Although, spurious tail behavior is experienced when the optimization is imposed due to the addition of a quadratic polynomial corrector, the natural property of creation of moments remains in the discrete problem. This allows to minimize such spurious behavior by appropriate choice of simulation parameters. Furthermore, conservation of mass and energy limits the negative mass produced by the numerical scheme which is essential for long time accurate simulations.

7 Acknowledgements

R. Alonso acknowledges the support from ONR grants N000140910290 and nsf-rnms 1107465. I. M. Gamba acknowledges support from NSF grant DMS-1413064. H. S. Tharkabhushanam acknowledges support from NSF grant DMS-0807712. The authors thank and gratefully acknowledged the hospitality and support from the Institute of Computational Engineering and Sciences and the University of Texas Austin.

8 Appendix

8.1 Shannon Sampling Theorem

The following result is an extension of the standard approximation estimate for regular functions by Fourier series expansions, *Shannon Sampling Theorem*, to $H^\alpha(\Omega_L)$ space. We include here the result for completeness of the reading.

Lemma 8.1 (Fourier Approximation Estimate)**.** *Let $g \in H^\alpha(\Omega_L)$, then*

$$\|g - \Pi^N g\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \leq \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \left(\frac{L}{2\pi N}\right)^\alpha \|g\|_{H^\alpha(\Omega_L)}. \tag{8.1}$$

Proof. Parseval's relation gives

$$\|g - \Pi^N g\|_{L^2(\Omega_L)} = \sqrt{\sum_{k>N} |\hat{g}(\zeta_k)|^2}.$$

Furthermore, properties of the Fourier transform implies

$$|\hat{g}(\zeta_k)| = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^d |(\zeta_k^j)^{\alpha_j}|} \left|\widehat{D^\alpha g}(\zeta_k)\right|$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k>N} |\hat{g}_N(\zeta_k)|^2 &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \sum_{k>N} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^d |(\zeta_k^j)^{\alpha_j}|^2} \left|\widehat{D^\alpha g}(\zeta_k)\right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^d |(\zeta_N^j)^{\alpha_j}|^2} \sum_{k>N} \left|\widehat{D^\alpha g}(\zeta_k)\right|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Observe that the sum in last inequality equals the L^2-norm square of $D^\alpha g - \Pi^N D^\alpha g$, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k>N} |\hat{g}_N(\zeta_k)|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^d |(\zeta_N^j)^{\alpha_j}|^2} \left\|D^\alpha g - \Pi^N D^\alpha g\right\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^d |(\zeta_N^j)^{\alpha_j}|^2} \|D^\alpha g\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_L)}.\end{aligned}$$

Conclude recalling the definition of $\zeta_N = \frac{2\pi N}{L}$. ∎

8.2 Estimate on the decay of the Collision operator

Theorem 8.2. *The following estimate holds for any $k \geq 0$ and $\lambda \in [0,2]$,*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega_L} Q(f,f)(v)\, dv \right| \leq O_k\big(m_{k+1}(f) m_0(f) + Z_k(f)\big).$$

The term $Z_k(f)$ is defined below in (8.3) *and only depends on moments up to order k. In particular one has*

$$Z_k(f) \leq 2^k\, m_1(f)\, m_k(f). \tag{8.2}$$

Proof. For the negative part,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega_L} Q^-(f,f)(v) \mathrm{d}v \right| \leq L^{-\lambda k} \int_{|v| \geq L} Q^-(|f|,|f|)(v) |v|^{\lambda k} \mathrm{d}v \leq L^{-\lambda k} \big(m_{k+1} m_0 + m_k m_0 \big)\,.$$

For the positive part,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega_L} Q^+(f,f)(v) \mathrm{d}v \right| &\leq L^{-\lambda k} \int_{|v| \geq L} Q^+(|f|,|f|)(v) |v|^{\lambda k} \mathrm{d}v \\ &= L^{-\lambda k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |f(v)||f(v_\star)||u|^\lambda \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |v'|^{\lambda k} b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma) \mathrm{d}\sigma \mathrm{d}v_\star \mathrm{d}v \end{aligned}$$

Note,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |v'|^{\lambda k} b(\hat{u}\cdot\sigma) \mathrm{d}\sigma \leq \|b\|_{L^1(S^{d-1})} \left(|v|^2 + |v_\star|^2 \right)^{\lambda k/2} \leq \|b\|_{L^1(S^{d-1})} \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ j \end{array} \right) |v|^{\lambda j} |v_\star|^{\lambda(k-j)}\,.$$

Use the inequality $|u|^\lambda \leq |v|^\lambda + |v_\star|^\lambda$ with the previous expressions to obtain,

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega_L} Q^+(f,f)(v) \mathrm{d}v \right| \leq 2 \|b\|_{L^1(S^{d-1})} L^{-\lambda k} \big(m_{k+1}(f) m_0(f) + Z_k(f) \big)\,,$$

where

$$Z_k(f) := \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ j \end{array} \right) m_{j+1}(f) m_{k-j}(f). \tag{8.3}$$

Furthermore, note that interpolation implies for $0 \leq j \leq k-1$

$$m_{j+1}(f) \leq m_1(f)^{\frac{k-1-j}{k-1}}\, m_k(f)^{\frac{j}{k-1}}\,, \quad m_{k-j}(f) \leq m_1(f)^{\frac{j}{k-1}}\, m_k(f)^{\frac{k-1-j}{k-1}}\,.$$

Therefore,

$$m_{j+1}(f)\, m_{k-j}(f) \leq m_1(f)\, m_k(f)\,, \quad 0 \leq j \leq k-1\,.$$

This implies that

$$Z_k(f) \leq m_1(f)\, m_k(f) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ j \end{array} \right) \leq 2^k\, m_1(f)\, m_k(f)\,.$$

□

8.3 L^2-theory of the Collision operator

The next theorem readily follows from the arguments in Lemma 4.1 [45] where elastic and inelastic hard sphere interactions are discussed. For additional discussion on constants we refer to [2], [3].

Theorem 8.3 (Collision Integral Estimate for Elastic/ Inelastic Collisions)**.** *For $f, g \in L^{1,2}_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ one has the estimate*

$$\|Q(f,g)\|_{L^2_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \left(\|f\|_{L^2_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|g\|_{L^1_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|f\|_{L^1_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|g\|_{L^2_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right) \tag{8.4}$$

where the dependence of the constant is $C := C(d, \|b\|_1)$.

Theorem 8.3 and Leibniz formula proves the following theorem. We refer to Section 4 in [45] for additional discussion in the Hard-sphere case. Recall Leibniz formula

$$\partial^\alpha Q(f,g) = \sum_{j \leq \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{j} Q(\partial^{\alpha - j} f, \partial^j g)\,, \tag{8.5}$$

where j and α are multi-indices.

Theorem 8.4 (Sobolev Bound Estimate)**.** *Let $\mu > 1 + \frac{d}{2\lambda}$. For $f, g \in H^\alpha_{k+\mu}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the collision operator satisfies*

$$\|Q(f,g)\|^2_{H^\alpha_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \sum_{j \leq \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{j} \left(\|f\|^2_{H^{\alpha-j}_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|g\|^2_{H^j_{k+\mu}(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \|f\|^2_{H^{\alpha-j}_{k+\mu}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|g\|^2_{H^j_{k+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right), \tag{8.6}$$

where the dependence of the constant is $C := C(d, \alpha, \|b\|_1)$.

Proof. Using Theorem 8.3, for any $j \leq \alpha$ multi-indexes,

$$\|Q(\partial^{\alpha-j} f, \partial^j g)\|^2_{L^2_k} \leq C_1 \left(\|\partial^{\alpha-j} f\|^2_{L^2_{k+1}} \|\partial^j g\|^2_{L^1_{k+1}} + \|\partial^{\alpha-j} f\|^2_{L^1_{k+1}} \|\partial^j g\|^2_{L^2_{k+1}} \right),$$

with constant $C_1 := C_1(d, \|b\|_1)$. Hölder's inequality implies that for any $\mu > \frac{d}{2} + \lambda$ and smooth function ϕ,

$$\|\partial^j \phi\|_{L^1_{k+1}} \leq \left\| \langle v \rangle^{\lambda - \mu} \right\|_{L^2} \|\partial^j \phi\|_{L^2_{k+\mu}}\,.$$

Therefore,

$$\|Q(\partial^{\alpha-j} f, \partial^j g)\|^2_{L^2_k} \leq C_2 \left(\|\partial^{\alpha-j} f\|^2_{L^2_{k+1}} \|\partial^j g\|^2_{L^2_{k+\mu}} + \|\partial^{\alpha-j} f\|^2_{L^2_{k+\mu}} \|\partial^j g\|^2_{L^2_{k+1}} \right). \tag{8.7}$$

Using Leibniz formula (8.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q(f,g)\|^2_{H^\alpha_k} &= \sum_{j \leq \alpha} \|\partial^j Q(f,g)\|^2_{L^2_k} \\ &\leq \sum_{j \leq \alpha} \sum_{l \leq j} \binom{j}{l} \|Q(\partial^{j-l} f, \partial^l g)\|^2_{L^2_k}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{8.8}$$

Inserting estimate (8.7) in (8.8) one has that the double sum is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_2 \sum_{j\le\alpha}\sum_{l\le j} \Big(\|\partial^{j-l} f\|^2_{L^2_{k+1}} \|\partial^l g\|^2_{L^2_{k+\mu}} + \|\partial^{j-l} f\|^2_{L^2_{k+\mu}} \|\partial^l g\|^2_{L^2_{k+1}} \Big) \\
\le C_3 \sum_{j\le\alpha} \binom{\alpha}{j} \Big(\|\partial^{\alpha-j} f\|^2_{L^2_{k+1}} \|\partial^j g\|^2_{L^2_{k+\mu}} + \|\partial^{\alpha-j} f\|^2_{L^2_{k+\mu}} \|\partial^j g\|^2_{L^2_{k+1}} \Big) \\
\le C_3 \sum_{j\le\alpha} \binom{\alpha}{j} \Big(\|f\|^2_{H^{\alpha-j}_{k+1}} \|g\|^2_{H^j_{k+\mu}} + \|f\|^2_{H^{\alpha-j}_{k+\mu}} \|g\|^2_{H^j_{k+1}} \Big) .
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Corollary 8.5. *Let $\mu > \frac{d}{2} + \lambda$. For $f \in H^\alpha_{k+\mu}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the collision operator satisfies the estimate*

$$
\|Q(f,f)\|_{H^\alpha_k(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C \|f\|^2_{H^\alpha_{k+\mu}(\mathbb{R}^d)} , \tag{8.9}
$$

The dependence of the constant is given by $C := C(d, \mu, \|b\|_1)$.

In this last section of the appendix we discuss briefly the gain of integrability in the gain collision operator. We refer to [5] for a more detailed discussion. This property is closely related with the operator $Q^+(f, \delta_0)$ and its Carleman's representation,

$$
Q^+_B(f,\delta_0)(v) = \frac{2^{d-1}}{|v|} \int_{v\cdot z=0} \frac{f(z+v)}{|z+v|^{d-2}} \, B\left(|z+v|, 1 - \frac{2|z|^2}{|z+v|^2} \right) \mathrm{d}\pi_z, \tag{8.10}
$$

where,

$$
B\left(|x_1|, x_2\right) = |x_1|^\lambda b(x_2) \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad x_2 \in [-1,1].
$$

Writing the Carleman's representation of the whole collision operator one can see a close relationship between these two operators expressed in the formula

$$
Q^+(g,f)(v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x) \tau_x Q^+(\tau_{-x} f, \delta_0)(v) \mathrm{d}x. \tag{8.11}
$$

The gain of integrability on $Q^+(g,f)$ is a consequence of the following proposition which follows in the same lines given in [5, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 8.6. *Assume that the angular kernel b is bounded. Then, for dimension $n \ge 3$ and potential $\lambda \in (0,1]$ the following estimate holds*

$$
\left\| Q^+_\lambda(f,\delta_0) \right\|_2 \le C \|b\|_\infty \left(\tfrac{\epsilon^{r'}}{r'} \|f\|_2 + \left(\tfrac{1}{r\,\epsilon^r} + 1 \right) \|f\|_{\frac{2d}{2d-1}} \right), \quad r = \tfrac{d-2}{\lambda} , \tag{8.12}
$$

where C_d is a explicit constant depending only on the dimension.

In this lemma Q^+_λ denotes the gain collision operator with potential $|u|^\lambda$.

Proof. Rewrite the potential as

$$
\begin{aligned}
|u|^\lambda &= |u|^\lambda \mathbf{1}_{\{|u|\le 1\}} + |u|^\lambda \mathbf{1}_{\{|u|\ge 1\}} \\
&\le \Big(\frac{\mu^{r'}}{r'} + \frac{1}{r\mu^r} |u|^{\lambda r} \Big) \mathbf{1}_{\{|u|\le 1\}} + |u|^\lambda \mathbf{1}_{\{|u|\ge 1\}} =: B_1(|u|) + B_2(|u|).
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the techniques presented in [5, Lemma 2.1] it readily follows that

$$\|Q^+_{B_1}(f,\delta_0)(v)\|_2 \le C_d\|b\|_\infty\big(\epsilon^{r'}\,\|f\|_2 + \tfrac{1}{\epsilon^r}\,\|f\|_{\frac{2d}{2d-1}}\big)\,,$$
$$\|Q^+_{B_2}(f,\delta_0)(v)\|_2 \le C_d\|b\|_\infty\,\|f\|_{\frac{2d}{2d-1}}\,.$$

Indeed, using formula (8.10) one has

$$Q^+_{B_i}(f,\delta_0)(v)) \le \|b\|_\infty\,\frac{2^{d-1}}{|v|}\int_{v\cdot z=0} f_i(z+v)\,\mathrm{d}\pi_z\,,$$

where $f_i(v) = f(v)\,|v|^{-(d-2)}\,B_i(|v|)$. From here, it suffices to follow the method of proof suggested in this reference for each of this functions. The fact that $\lambda \in (0,1]$ is important in the second estimate. □

We can compute the L^2 norm of the whole operator using Minkowski's integral inequality

$$\begin{aligned}\|Q^+_\lambda(g,f)\|_2 &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g(x)\tau_x Q^+_\lambda(\tau_{-x}f,\delta_0)(v)\mathrm{d}x\right)^2\mathrm{d}v\right)^{1/2}\\ &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\big(\tau_x Q^+_\lambda(\tau_{-x}f,\delta_0)(v)\big)^2\,\mathrm{d}v\right)^{1/2} g(x)\mathrm{d}x\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\|Q^+_\lambda(\tau_{-x}f,\delta_0)\|_2\;g(x)\mathrm{d}x\,,\end{aligned}\tag{8.13}$$

where the potential will be restricted to $\lambda \in (0,1]$. From this estimate, Proposition 8.6 and Lebesgue interpolation follows the estimate

$$\|Q^+_\lambda(g,f)\|_2 \le C\|b\|_\infty\|g\|_1\big(\tfrac{\epsilon^{r'}}{r'}\,\|f\|_2 + \tfrac{1}{r\epsilon^r}\|f\|_1^{1-\theta}\|f\|_2^{\theta}\big)\,.\tag{8.14}$$

Theorem 8.7. *The collision operator satisfies the estimate for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \ge 0$*

$$\|Q^+_\lambda(g,f)\|_{2,k} \le C\|b\|_\infty\|g\|_{1,k}\big(\tfrac{\epsilon^{r'}}{r'}\,\|f\|_{2,k} + \tfrac{1}{r\epsilon^r}\|f\|_{1,k}^{1-\theta}\|f\|_{2,k}^{\theta}\big)\,,$$

where $\theta = \frac{1}{d}$, $r = \frac{d-2}{\lambda}$ and C_n constant depending only on the dimension.

Proof. It suffices to explain how to include the weight $\langle\cdot\rangle^{\lambda k}$ in the norms. Note the pointwise estimate $\langle v\rangle \le \langle v'\rangle\langle v'_*\rangle$. As a consequence, for any $k \ge 0$,

$$Q^+_\lambda(g,h)(v)\langle v\rangle^{\lambda k} \le Q^+_\lambda(\tilde g,\tilde h)(v),$$

where $\tilde\psi(v) := \psi(v)\langle v\rangle^{\lambda k}$. Therefore,

$$\|Q^+_\lambda(g,h)\|_{2,k} = \|Q^+_\lambda(g,h)(v)\langle v\rangle^{\lambda k}\|_2 \le \|Q^+_\lambda(\tilde g,\tilde h)\|_2.$$

Using this observation in (8.14) yields the result. □

References

[1] R. Alonso, J. Canizo, I. Gamba, and C. Mouhot, *A new approach to the creation and propagation of exponential moments in the boltzmann equation*, Comm. Part. Diff. Equat. **38** (2013), no. 1, 155–169.

[2] R. Alonso and E. Carneiro, *Estimates for the Boltzmann collision operator via radial symmetry and fourier transform.*, Adv. Math. **223** (2010), no. 2, 511–528.

[3] R. Alonso, E. Carneiro, and I. M. Gamba, *Convolution inequalities for the Boltzmann collision operator*, Comm. Math. Physics. **298** (2010), no. 2, 293–322.

[4] R. Alonso and I.M. Gamba, $L^1 - L^\infty$ *maxwellian bounds for the derivatives of the solution of the homogeneous boltzmann equation*, Journal de Mathematiques Pures et Appliquees (to appear) (2008).

[5] ———, *Gain of integrability for the Boltzmann collisional operator*, Kinetic and Related Models **4** (2011), no. 4, 41–51.

[6] R. Alonso and B. Lods, *Free cooling and high-energy tails of granular gases with variable restitution coefficient*, Commun. Math. Sci. **11** (2013), no. 3, 807–862.

[7] L. Arkeryd, Intermolecular forces of infinite range and the Boltzmann equation. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 77(1):11-21, 1981.

[8] G. A. Bird, *Molecular gas dynamics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994.

[9] A. V. Bobylev, *Exact solutions of the nonlinear Boltzmann equation and the theory of relaxation of a Maxwellian gas*, Translated from Teoreticheskaya i Mathematicheskaya Fizika **60** (1984), 280 – 310.

[10] ———Moment inequalities for the Boltzmann equation and applications to spatially homogeneous problems. J. Statist. Phys., 88(5-6):1183-1214, 1997.

[11] A. V. Bobylev, J. A. Carrillo, and I. M. Gamba, *On some properties of kinetic and hydrodynamic equations for inelastic interactions*, J. Statist. Phys. **98** (2000), no. 3-4, 743–773. MR MR1749231 (2001c:82063)

[12] A. V. Bobylev and C. Cercignani, *Discrete velocity models without nonphysical invariants*, Journal of Statistical Physics **97** (1999), 677–686.

[13] ———, *Exact eternal solutions of the Boltzmann equation*, Journal of Statistical Physics **106** (2002), 1019–1038.

[14] ———, *Moment equations for a granular material in a thermal bath*, Journal of Statistical Physics **106** (2002), 547–567(21).

[15] ———, *Self-similar asymptotics for the Boltzmann equation with inleastic and elastic interactions*, Journal of Statistical Physics **110** (2003), 333–375.

[16] A. V. Bobylev, C. Cercignani, and G. Toscani, *Proof of an asymptotic property of self-similar solutions of the Boltzmann equation for granular materials*, Journal of Statistical Physics **111** (2003), 403–417.

[17] A. V. Bobylev and I. M. Gamba, *Boltzmann equations for mixtures of maxwell gases: Exact solutions and power like tails*, Journal of Statistical Physics **124** (2006), 497–516.

[18] A. V. Bobylev, I. M. Gamba, and V. A. Panferov, *Moment inequalities and high-energy tails for Boltzmann equations with inelastic interactions*, J. Statist. Phys. **116** (2004), no. 5-6, 1651–1682. MR MR2096050 (2005g:82111)

[19] A. V. Bobylev, M. Groppi, and G. Spiga, *Approximate solutions to the problem of stationary shear flow of smooth granular materials*, Eur. J. Mech. B Fluids **21** (2002), 91–103.

[20] A. V. Bobylev and S. Rjasanow, *Difference scheme for the Boltzmann equation based on the Fast Fourier Transform*, European journal of mechanics. B, Fluids **16:22** (1997), 293–306.

[21] ———, *Fast deterministic method of solving the Boltzmann equation for hard spheres*, Eur. J. Mech. B Fluids **18** (1999), no. 5, 869–887.

[22] ———, *Numerical solution of the Boltzmann equation using fully conservative difference scheme based on the Fast Fourier Transform*, Transport Theory Statist. Phys. **29** (2000), 289–310.

[23] A.V. Bobylev, C. Cercignani, and I. M. Gamba, *On the self-similar asymptotic for generalized non-linear kinetic maxwell models*, Comm. Math. Phys. **291** (2009), 599–644.

[24] F. Bouchut and L. Desvillettes, *A proof of the smoothing properties of the positive part of boltzmann's kernel*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **14** (1998), no. 1, 47–61.

[25] J. E. Broadwell, *Study of rarefied shear flow by the discrete velocity method*, J. Fluid Mech. **19** (1964), 401–414.

[26] H. Cabannes, *Global solution of the initial value problem for the discrete Boltzmann equation*, Arch. Mech. (Arch. Mech. Stos.) **30** (1978), 359–366.

[27] T, Carleman, Problèmes mathématiques dans la théorie cinétique des gaz. Publ. Sci. Inst. Mittag-Leffler, 2. Almqvist and Wiksell, Uppsala, 1957.

[28] C. Cercignani, *Recent developments in the mechanics of granular materials*, Fisica matematica e ingegneria delle strutture, Bologna: Pitagora Editrice (1995), 119–132.

[29] ———, *Shear flow of a granular material*, Journal of Statistical Physics **102** (2001), 1407–1415.

[30] C. Cercignani and H. Cornille, *Shock waves for a discrete velocity gas mixture*, Journal of Statistical Physics **99** (2000), 115–140.

[31] C. Cercignani, I. Reinhard, and M. Pulvirenti, *The mathematical theory of dilute gases*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 106, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[32] L. Desvillettes. Some applications of the method of moments for the homogeneous Boltzmann and Kac equations. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., 123(4):387?404, 1993.

[33] L. Desvillettes and C. Villani, *On the trend to global equilibrium for spatially inhomogeneous kinetic systems: the Boltzmann equation*, Invent. Math. **159** (2005), no. 2, 245–316.

[34] R. Duduchava, R. Kirsch, and S. Rjasanow, *On estimates of the Boltzmann collision operator with cut-off*, Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics **8** (April 2006), 242–266(25).

[35] M. H. Ernst and R. Brito, *Driven inelastic Maxwell models with high energy tails*, Phys. Rev. E. **65** (2002), no. 4, 040301.

[36] ———, *Scaling solutions of inelastic Boltzmann equations with over-populated high energy tails*, Journal of Statistical Physics **109** (2002), 407–432.

[37] F. Filbet and C. Mouhot, *Analysis of spectral methods for the homogeneous Boltzmann equation*, Transactions of the american mathematical society **363** (2010), 1947 – 1980.

[38] F. Filbet, C. Mouhot, and L. Pareschi, *Solving the Boltzmann equation in nlogn*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **28** (2006), 1029–1053.

[39] F. Filbet and G. Russo, *High order numerical methods for the space non homogeneous Boltzmann equation*, Journal of Computational Physics **186** (2003), 457–480.

[40] ———, *High order numerical methods for the space non homogeneous Boltzmann equation*, Journal of Computational Physics **186** (2003), 457 – 480.

[41] N. Fournier and S. Mischler, *A Boltzmann equation for elastic, inelastic and coalescing collisions*, Journal de mathematiques pures et appliques **84** (2005), 1173–1234.

[42] M. Frigo and S. G. Johnson, *Fast Fourier Transform of the west.*

[43] E. Gabetta, L. Pareschi, and G. Toscani, *Relaxation schemes for nonlinear kinetic equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **34** (1997), 2168–2194.

[44] Gamba,I.M. and Haack,J.R.; A conservative spectral method for the Boltzmann equation with anisotropic scattering and the grazing collisions limit, Jour. Computational Physcis, V. 270, 40-57. (2014).

[45] I. M. Gamba, V. Panferov, and C. Villani, *On the Boltzmann equation for diffusively excited granular media*, Comm. Math. Phys. **246** (2004), no. 3, 503–541.

[46] ———, *Upper Maxwellian bounds for the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal **194** (2009), 253–282.

[47] I. M. Gamba, S. Rjasanow, and W. Wagner, *Direct simulation of the uniformly heated granular Boltzmann equation*, Mathematical and Computer Modelling **42** (2005), 683–700.

[48] I. M. Gamba and S. H. Tharkabhushanam, *Spectral - lagrangian methods for collisional models of non - equilibrium statistical states*, Journal of Computational Physics **228** (2009), no. 6, 2012–2036.

[49] ———, *Shock and boundary structure formation by spectral-lagrangian methods for the inhomogeneous boltzmann transport equation*, Jour. Comp. Math **28** (2010), 430–460.

[50] H. Grad, *Singular and nonuniform limits of solutions of the Boltzmann equation.*, Transport Theory (Proc. Sympos. Appl. Math., New York, 1967), SIAM-AMS Proc., Vol. I, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1969, pp. 269–308. MR MR0255205 (40 #8410)

[51] M. Herty, L. Pareschi, and M. Seaid, *Discrete-velocity models and relaxation schemes for traffic flows*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **28** (2006), 1582–1596.

[52] I. Ibragimov and S. Rjasanow, *Numerical solution of the Boltzmann equation on the uniform grid*, Computing **69** (2002), 163–186.

[53] R. Illner, *On the derivation of the time-dependent equations of motion for an ideal gas with discrete velocity distribution*, J. de Mecanique **17** (1978), 781–796.

[54] S. Kawashima, *Global solution of the initial value problem for a discrete velocity model of the Boltzmann equation*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **57** (1981), 19–24.

[55] R. Kirsch and S. Rjasanow, *A weak formulation of the Boltzmann equation based on the Fourier transform*, J. Stat. Phys. **129** (2007), no. 3, 483–492. MR MR2351412

[56] M. Krook and Tai Tsun Wu, *Formation of Maxwellian tails*, Physical Review Letters **36** (1976), 1107–1109.

[57] Landau,L.D.; and Lifschitz,E. M.; Statistical Physics, *3rd ed, Butterworth-Heinemann, 1980*

[58] Landau,L. D.; Kinetic equation for the case of Coulomb interaction, *Zh. eks. teor. phys., vol. 7, 203,(1937).*

[59] L. Mieussens, *Discrete-velocity models and numerical schemes for the Boltzmann-bgk equation in plane and axisymmetric geometries*, Journal of Computational Physics **162** (2000), 429–466.

[60] S. Mischler and C. Mouhot, *Cooling process for inelastic Boltzmann equations for hard spheres. II. Self-similar solutions and tail behavior*, J. Stat. Phys. **124** (2006), no. 2-4, 703–746. MR MR2264623 (2007g:82054)

[61] S. Mischler, C. Mouhot, and M. Rodriguez Ricard, *Cooling process for inelastic Boltzmann equations for hard spheres. I. The Cauchy problem*, J. Stat. Phys. **124** (2006), no. 2-4, 655–702. MR MR2264622 (2007g:82053)

[62] J. M. Montanero and A. Santos, *Computer simulation of uniformly heated granular fluids*, Gran. Matt. **2** (2000), 53–64.

[63] S. J. Moon, M. D. Shattuck, and J. B. Swift, *Velocity distributions and correlations in homogeneously heated granular media*, Physical Review E **64** (2001), 031303.

[64] C. Mouhot, *Rate of convergence to equilibrium for the spatially homogeneous boltzmann equation with hard potentials*, Comm. Math. Phys. **261** (2006), 629 – 672.

[65] C. Mouhot and L. Pareschi, *Fast algorithms for computing the Boltzmann collision operator*, Math. Comp. **75** (2006), 1833–1852.

[66] C. Mouhot and C. Villani, *Regularity theory for the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation with cut-off*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **173** (2004), no. 2, 169–212. MR MR2081030 (2006f:82073)

[67] A. Munafo, J.R. Haack, I.M. Gamba and T.E. Magin, *A Spectral-Lagrangian Boltzmann Solver for a Multi-Energy Level Gas*, Jour. Comp. Physcics 264, V. 152-176, (2014).

[68] K. Nanbu, *Direct simulation scheme derived from the Boltzmann equation i.monocomponent gases*, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **52** (1983), 2042 – 2049.

[69] L. Pareschi and B. Perthame, *A Fourier spectral method for homogenous Boltzmann equations*, Transport Theory Statist. Phys. **25** (2002), 369–382.

[70] L. Pareschi and G. Russo, *Numerical solution of the Boltzmann equation. i. spectrally accurate approximation of the collision operator*, SIAM J. Numerical Anal. (Online) **37** (2000), 1217–1245.

[71] S. Rjasanow and W. Wagner, *A stochastic weighted particle method for the Boltzmann equation*, Journal of Computational Physics (1996), 243–253.

[72] ———, *Stochastic numerics for the Boltzmann equation*, Springer, Berlin, 2005.

[73] E. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.

[74] T. van Noije and M. Ernst, *Velocity distributions in homogeneously cooling and heated granular fluids*, Gran. Matt. **1** (1998), no. 2, 57–64.

[75] C. Villani, *Handbook of fluid dynamics*, ch. A Review of Mathematical Topics in Collisional Kinetic Theory, pp. 71–306, Elsevier, 2003.

[76] W. Wagner, *A convergence proof for Bird's direct simulation monte carlo method for the Boltzmann equation*, Journal of Statistical Physics (1992), 1011–1044.

[77] B. Wennberg, *Entropy dissipation and moment production for the Boltzmann equation* . Statist. Phys. V.86 N. 5-6 pages 1053–1066, (1997).

[78] D. R. Williams and F.C. MacKintosh, *Driven granular media in one dimension: Correlations and equation of state*, Phys. Rev. E **54** (1996), 9–12.

[79] Y. Zheng and H. Struchtrup, *A linearization of Mieussens's discrete velocity model for kinetic equations*, Eur. J. Mech. B Fluids **26** (2007), 182–192.

[80] C.Zhang and I.M. Gamba, A Conservative Discontinuous Galerkin Solver for Space Homogeneous Boltzmann Equation. *In preparation, 2016.*

[81] C.Zhang and I.M. Gamba, A Conservative Scheme for Vlasov Poisson Landau Modeling Collisional Plasmas. *Submitted for publication, 2016.*